THE ARYAN PATH

Point out the "Way"—however dimly, and lost among the host—as does the evening star to those who tread their path in darkness.

—The Voice of the Silence

VOL. XIV SEPTEMBER 1943 No. 9

THE MOTE AND THE BEAM

Storm Jameson is not only a fine creative artist, she is an idealist engaged in humanitarian work, making her contribution to the fashioning of a better world. Among the problems discussed in Britain as well as in the U. S. A. there is one about the punishment to be meted out to the German people for allowing their leaders to let loose the dogs of war and supporting them in prosecuting it. The answer to the question that is the title of her article (which we take pleasure in printing below) cannot be given until another, the most fundamental question, is answered: What kind of a world is envisaged by those who possess the power and the influence to shape a new order? If the rest of the peoples of the world are to be pawns moved by the ruling powers on both sides of the Atlantic then "Vansittartism" could become their religion; and they must count, as best they can, the cost of their policy—social revolutions in European countries, Negro uprisings in the U. S. A. and in Africa and eventually a coming together of coloured peoples against their exploiters. But if Storm Jameson's reading be taken as correct, and in our opinion it is correct, that not only Germany but "the European States have involved the whole world in their ruin," and if the proposition be accepted as true, and in our opinion it is true, that "self-interest is and must be blind," then plans of revenge upon and punishment of Germans must be discarded as wicked.

The question which naturally arises is, if Nazi leaders and their cohorts are not to be punished and the Germans are not to be "taught a lesson," shall we let them prepare for another war? The counter-question has to be answered. Are Britain and the U. S. A. to be allowed to usher in conditions leading to another war? To what extent are Britain and the U. S. A. responsible for this war? Their failure, conjointly with France, to create a better world in 1919 should be

taken into account. The failure of the U. S. A. did not merely consist in withdrawing from the League of Nations; it did not retire to its own territory to enjoy its isolation; it continued—it could not help it—to influence other countries, to interfere in their affairs, however indirectly or without meaning to do so. France and Britain in their folly not only spoiled the peaceful atmosphere of Europe by their treatment of Germany; as Great Powers who manipulated affairs at Geneva they indulged in acts of injustice. They connived at Japan's exploit in Manchuria as a natural corollary to Versailles' disregard of justice to Korea suffering under the heel of Japan; and why? Was it not because of their own doings in their own respective dependencies and colonies? They had to allow Hitler his way in Austria and elsewhere because they had not faced, as just people should have, the crisis Mussolini had created in Abyssinia. It might be said—"But that all is a past story, why bring it up now?" Is it entirely a past story?

In 1918-19 and after, moral principles were given the go-by. The present enemies, Germany and Japan, have but perfected and followed the amoral, and even at times immoral, principles of the victors of the war of 1914-18. If the better world of tomorrow demands that Hitlerism be punished then equally true is it that it should be punished in all men and women wherever situated who have race-prejudice; if Germans are to be punished for their shameful treatment of the Jews, what about those Americans whose treatment of the Negroes has been condemned by right-thinking men since the days of the noble Lincoln? (We are not overlooking the splendid lead President Roosevelt has been giving to wipe out that blot on U. S. A. history.) And if the Japanese have to be punished for their treatment of Koreans for over a quarter of a century shall we not request that the British treatment of Indians, of Africans and other colonials be reviewed by an impartial tribunal? And equally—should not the arrogant caste-men, here in India, whatever their names, take their share of punishment for the sin of caste, class and community pride—the apotheosis of which is Untouchability? It is in the interest of Britain and France and the U. S. A. and the popes and purohits of every creed that the immoral talk of revenge and of punishing others be given up. Is there a single Western State whose record is clear and clean? Is there a single Occidental people strong enough to be humble to respect the Asiatic hordes as a valuable portion of the human race—as valuable as themselves?

The rulers and administrators belonging to the U. S. A. and Britain, France and Germany, Japan and China and India need to be educated. Another discussion is going in Britain —educating the Germans in right principles of democracy—especially

the school- and college-going population of the Germany of tomorrow. As Julian Huxley well pointed out in an article in *The New Statesman and Nation*,

there is, properly speaking, no such problem as German re-education. It cannot be considered in isolation, on its own merits; it can only be approached as part of the problem of European education and to a certain degree of world education.

We should like to emphasise—let world-education be the primary factor. Britain and France need re-educating as much as Germany. And General Smuts and his followers in South Africa must not be forgotten. Here in India the orthodox Hindus and the fanatical Muslims need to be re-educated as world-citizens as much as the British Viceroys and Governors and their white or brown secretaries and advisers.

The words of Gandhiji written in 1927 are easier of recognition today:—

Causes of hatred everywhere obtrude themselves on one's gaze. The seers of old saw that the only way of dealing with the situation was to neutralize hatred by love.

Not punishment of any but education of all should be the cry; and primarily education in moral principles of justice and equity, of tolerance and appreciation, of love and brotherliness. The world of today, even while the war is still going on, needs men and women with a conviction of the need for global betterment. Those who think in terms of the good of all peoples, not only of their own; those who are prepared to liquidate their "government by exploitation" and to acquire the capacity to live not in strength only but in goodness also; those who are ready to recognise their own animalism and blemishes and to perceive that in the so-called backward peoples also there is virtue and wisdom;—such men and women alone can build a new order. Such most probably will have to clarify their own minds so that their intuition may become articulate and become the guiding principle of their actions. And can that intuition be formulated in words better than those of Gandhiji written in 1919:—

Hatred ever kills, love never dies. Such is the vast difference between the two. What is obtained by love is retained for all time. What is obtained by hatred proves a burden in reality, for it increases hatred. The duty of a human being is to diminish hatred and to promote love.

SHOULD THE ENEMY BE PUNISHED AFTER THE WAR IS OVER ?

Begin by supposing that neither you who read nor I who write want vengeance. We do not want an eye for an eye, a dead child for a dead child. It would be, as they say, natural, if a Czech felt the impulse to put a German village to the torture of Lidice, if a Pole wished German towns to know the terror of mass executions. We who have not known these things in our own bodies or—which is far worse—in the bodies of our children and parents, have no right to cry blame. Yet it is certain that such vengeance brings only anguish—even to the avenger. Many who will agree that this is so, will say: No vengeance, but only a just punishment of the guilty, of the men who ordered cruelties, of men who used their power as conquerors to torture, rob, murder. We must make it plain, they will say, that such inhuman crimes are always followed by retribution. Why? Because we want to issue a stern warning for the future. Also, we must do justice. Why? Because it is just to do justice. And it is unjust to say, Go in peace, to a man who has taken away the happiness of many helpless and guiltless people.

To say, as is true, that the guilt of war rests on every people—since in no people was there found enough wisdom, generosity, courage, to turn aside the war many men saw coming—settles nothing. We are still left with our two unanswered questions. We want to make another war unlikely (do not let us say impossible —nothing, in human nature, is impossible) : will punishing the enemy after this war make another war unlikely ? We want to act according to our highest conception of justice: is punishment (of a cruel enemy) part of this justice ? Will it establish more firmly among us the ideas of justice and human decency ? Perhaps it is impossible to answer these questions. We are not excused from trying to answer them, since we are not excused from action, and the action we shall take after this war depends on the answer.

Let us first clear our minds, if we can, about the difference between forgiveness and pardon. We can pardon without forgiving. It is easier to pardon than to forgive. I am not sure that we have the right to forgive any injury done to any person except ourselves. Certainly I would not take it on myself to say to the man who ordered Polish school-boys to be shot against the wall of their school: I forgive you. It is recorded that Christ had the compassion to say in His agony: Father, forgive them, they know not what they do. It is not recorded that even His Mother said, I forgive you, to the high priests. I could not say, I forgive you, to the man who sent the *City of Benares* to the bottom, even if it were proved to me that he did not know it was

filled with children. And if, after this war, a German airman was brought to me and they said: This man's hand sent down the bomb which killed your sweet young sister, making her children motherless and darkening more lives than one...I could not say to him, I forgive you. It would be a lie. But neither should I wish to punish him for obeying his orders. And surely there must be a German woman who feels as I do. Who feels that to pardon it is not necessary to forgive. The reason can pardon what the heart cannot forgive. Even the heart can, without forgiveness, pardon.

It would be unjust to punish the humble millions who were obeying orders. Unjust to punish the German soldier who obeyed the order to tear their children from the women of Lidice. But what of the men who were responsible for these orders? The leaders, civil and military, who planned a policy of enslavement and massacre? Surely it would be unjust *not* to punish them? Surely it would be wise to punish them—as a warning? There is no easy answer to these questions.

As a warning. But think. Is not this war, like the last, itself a hideous warning? And if we imagine that we are being warned by it only of the dangers of German aggressiveness, we shall be making a mistake for which our children will pay, with their lives. Something deeper than the greedy force of pan-Germanism is at work in Europe. The ground was prepared for pan-Germanism by the deep collapse of the old unity of Europe, of the old conception of Europe as Christendom. We are living now through the final stages of this collapse. At no time was Europe materially united, but there was a time when the idea of Europe as a spiritual entity had a real existence. The ghost of this idea lingered for a long time among the living Empires and States. These ceased to pay it even lip service as they turned wholly to the idea of their separate existences as great Powers whose highest duty was to remain great, to become greater. No doubt it should have been possible for them to agree on a rational scheme of live and let-live. Many such schemes were made, many are being made now. Why did they all fail? Because *self-interest is and must be blind.* Because Empires and States do not willingly act with the good sense and generosity of which men are capable. They have histories but no memory. Tearing themselves to pieces, *the European States have involved the whole world in their ruin,* because innumerable nerves of moral and physical force run from Europe to every other civilisation.

There is no hope for Europe or the world in what used to be called enlightened self-interest. Because there is no such thing. Self-interest is a darkness to all but the self, and when light breaks into it, the darkness ceases to exist. If the self-interested States can turn outwards to something greater and more compelling than themselves, if Europe

can be born again as a unity, in which separate national forms are subsumed, there is hope. (More is involved than the peace of Europe. The spiritual rebirth of Europe involves a change in the European attitude to other civilisations—to take a pressing instance, in the attitude of Great Britain to India.) This new birth may not take place—at this time. There may be a further breakdown to come, a new Dark Age, after which the birth would be difficult and painful. But there is no other hope, easier or narrower. We delude ourselves if we think there is, or if we think that it will come without belief and work.

In a Europe struggling to be born again, Germany has its place, which no other people can fill. The capacity of the Germans for discipline and obedience, their courage, misused now to bring death on Europe, must in some way be given other work to do. There is an energy in the German people which, if no good outlet is found for it, will find a bad one, will turn murderous: the murderous energy of the Nazis was first used on their countrymen until their leaders felt strong enough to turn it outside. *Had there been, in 1919, the impulse to re-create the unity of Europe—or rather, had this impulse been stronger than the natural and on its own level good impulse of the separate peoples to test their nationhood, the immense German energy need never have run to waste in misery, unemployment, and finally in Hitler.* To decide that the Germans are naturally murderous is a moral evasion of the real danger. It is their energy that makes them dangerous. If, after this war, it is not directed to a labour of re-creation, it will again direct itself to destroy. (The English, a subtler people, will probably, if they are disappointed again, choose to die out.) To penalise the German people, to try to keep them in a position which is less than their real qualities fit them for, will be only cowardly and short-sighted. Set us all to honest work, Germans included, with the tools science has put in our hands, but let it be, everywhere, a work of construction and creation —and there will be hope of peace. There is no other.

" And so you would not punish even the Himmlers ? "

Think. No punishment a decent human being could inflict on a man who had ordered, as a matter of policy, the slaying of hundreds, thousands, of defenceless men, women, children, would equal his crime. Nor would there be any comfort in it for the survivors. For such cruelty, death, whether quick or brutal, is not a punishment. Would it not be better to say—without pride, since we have all sinned—to these men: " You have proved that you are unfit to have any power over other people. We shall take care that you can never again make another human being unhappy. You will become labourers in the settlement, monastery, prison, call it what you like, we have prepared for you. More merciful than you have been, we shall not take from you life and the light of the sky. We shall only take from you, and that for the rest of your time, your power."

STORM JAMESON

[Under instructions from our esteemed contributor, Storm Jameson, we have forwarded her honorarium for the above article to the Bijapur Famine Fund.—ED.]

SOCIAL SERVICE

A MINISTRY OF THE SPIRIT

[**Ralph Richard Keithahn,** B. D. of Chicago Theological Seminary and M. A. of Yale University, came out to India and worked at Madura as an Educational Missionary (1925-1930). Because he preferred to be more of a Christian and less of a churchman he had to sever his connection with the American Madura Mission and returned to the United States: there he joined the New York Divinity School to study comparative religions; then he laboured as a rural missionary in South Dakota from 1932-34, returning to India in 1935. He helped the Harijans at Devakottai and settled in Bangalore in 1937 where he has been rendering most useful service and has been instrumental in starting recently a new Rural Centre on the outskirts of Bangalore City. In all his labour of love Mrs. Keithahn has been a devoted helpmate.—ED.]

When a social worker went to Maharishi at Tiruvanamalai enquiring as to what could be done for the Harijans, he was greatly disappointed when the Rishi is said to have replied, " Why do you trouble about such matters ! " Perhaps the worker did not catch the message the wise man had for him.

Recently, an understanding friend, in leaving a rural worker who protested that he had not done anything, said, " If you are here, it is enough ! " Evidently the assumption was that the individuals concerned in the service had something worth while to give; there was no reason for being anxious how to institutionalize such giving, if I may put it so.

The successor of Jane Addams as the head of Hull House, in Chicago, U. S. A., recently resigned her position when the Board of Directors refused to allow her to carry on her " outside activities " because someone said, "People would stop giving to the work." (sic !) That balloon was exploded when another member of the same Board offered to be responsible for Hull House finances, which offer was not accepted ! Yes, allowed to run a social service institution but not allowed to promote its implications !

The two great social workers of the past generation of Chicago were Jane Addams and Graham Taylor. One of the privileges of my life was to have been a student of the latter. Both organised two well known institutions : Hull House and Chicago Commons, through which they made remarkable contributions to the community. But those of us who knew Jane Addams and Graham Taylor know full well that the significance of their work lay not in the " services " their institutions rendered—no matter how great such help was to the unprivileged citizen. But these were fighting Christian prophets—fighters for justice; pio-

neering and faithful democrats—pioneers of a complete citizenship; revolutionary spiritual leaders—brothers of all men. They were members of the Protestant Church but worked to a large extent among Roman Catholics—not to proselytise, but to rise with them to a fuller realisation of the worship of the Spirit.

In India we have rightly admired the great social service institutions of the West. More often we have observed their remarkable growth and have known little of the spirit and life in which they originated. We have begun to duplicate those institutions and have done our job well. But all too often we are today missing the revolutionary purpose or significance of such institutions. Nearby is an admirable home for destitute Hindu women. I have been most sympathetic with its struggle for existence. But Harijan girls are not allowed in the institution ! Are they not Hindus ? ! Or human ! ? Or in need ! ? Has not the institution already lost its true reason for being ? Our work is not merely to salvage a needy individual here or there. *Our work is to save Society itself. And that is primarily a work of the spirit. It demands a revolution in Hindu and all society !*

A social service institution should be primarily a cell of *Truthfulness*, of *Non-violence*, of *Suffering Love*, of *Selflessness*, of *Thoughtful Study*, whence men and women emerge to challenge the Community to the True Way of Life. Yes, we shall be doing "ambulance work"—giving first aid to the needy brother or sister at our door. But our *primary* concern will not be the 397 out-patients in the dispensary, hoping to make it a record next time ! A successful medical practitioner in America said recently that a doctor could not take satisfactory care of more than a dozen patients a year ! Nor will we be concerned either with the multiplication of mere institutions. We shall get down to fundamentals. We shall diagnose the disease with which we are concerned. And then we'll work systematically at the causes. Then only can I conceive of a movement towards a Society of truth, of selflessness, of non-violence, of co-operating love. And that is revolution in the kind of world we live in today. We must be cells of this New Life. Jane Addams and Graham Taylor were just that in Chicago. They were identified with every forward and upward movement in the community. They were ever at building for a better Democracy in their City and State. They were always found on the side of the "under-dog" and sufferer. Their institutions were but means for them to keep their feet on the ground for they were lovers of humanity; their souls tended to live in a world of ideals and longing. Many of us are like that and we need a ground wire. The social service institution serves that need. It helps to make our "pacifism" realistic—our spirituality concrete—our good-will substantial ! But the

institution without this Cell of Life has largely lost its reason for being. As the Ashram must have its Guru, so the social service institution must have its Pioneer of Life ! There is a tendency all over the world to develop social service institutions. All good. But these may be obstacles to necessary change. *India needs to re-evaluate her social work. Is it definitely working towards New Life ?*

Social workers always put the spiritual above the material. Of course, they work hard with material facts and forces. If any should know the importance of a good meal to a man, they certainly must know. They will be most sensitive to the suffering of the naked. They will ever be naked themselves in such suffering. And their institutions with them ! Charlie Andrews irritated his well-wishers by passing on the gift of a coat to one who was in greater need. Gandhiji may use a special train for his country. But for himself only the loin-cloth of the poor ! For although we have learned the essential material requirements of man, yet we also know the destiny of man. We know that it means nothing to win all the world and lose one's soul ! A lesson all the world needs today as man seeks through " black markets " and numberless dishonest ways to rob the poor and " feather his own nest." The things of eternity are of the Spirit, not of rupees, annas and pies. And we want every man to have the privilege to know the World of Eternal Values and to be able to choose " God rather than mammon " if he so desire. Most of mankind do not have that privilege today. How many have to sell their souls for the potage of a scholarship, a job or a place in society ! It is easy to condemn the slum or village dweller. But how can *he* think in terms of eternal values with exploiting brothers and sisters on his back and his own stomach empty ! We do place the spirit above the material—at least in theory ! Do we do it in practice ? *Are our social institutions truly making possible the life of the Spirit for the ordinary man of today ?* If so, they are institutions of revolution, of substantial change in the society of the twentieth century !

I often wonder about religious groups which conduct social service institutions, for example, Christian Missions. They give testimony without ceasing that they are bringing the " Source of the Abundant Life ! " And yet they carry on institutions of service that do much good but are so patterned by Government requirements, so cramped by Government grants, so handicapped by anything but a spiritually-minded staff, in many cases, that the result can never be the Abundant Life. And the political reformer rightly looks upon such as opiates to the New Order. Such are more often than not the supporters of reaction, which always supports vested interests, and never the pioneers of a New Era. And certainly not the support of the Living Spirit !

Workers with the handicapped of humanity know themselves as world citizens. Jane Addams was rightly recognised as a great worker for World Peace. We think rightly of our Kagawas, our Gandhis, our Grenfells as men of universal peace and import. Such make no distinctions between races, creeds, castes or classes. Ordinarily, social service institutions do rise above these local distinctions. And yet a few, as I have already cited, negative their ultimate contribution, by accepting man-made distinctions.

The Harijan Seva Sangh is a repentant effort on the part of caste Hindus. But often circumstances have made them realise that *all* of us were concerned. *The Negro problem of America, the problem of the coloured man in South Africa are all a part of the caste problem of the world.* And each one of us may have his own special contribution to make. But we shall miss our goal unless we stand as brothers at the larger task. Institutions always tend to localize and over-simplify the problem. The true social worker sees the problem in its true world perspective—in the perspective of the whole community. I have no doubt that Gandhiji sees the Harijan problem in its world setting. But the institution he has brought into being is all too often localized in its own peculiar problem and it loses its mission of life. Institutions always tend to narrow one's vision. And especially when those in one are desirous of building up a large institution. The true founder of a movement keeps his heart close to the peculiar need of mankind for which he is concerned. He thinks in terms of radical change for a great need. The institution grows naturally about him and the work. Or it may not grow at all. John Woolman was one of the greatest of social workers. He was one of the few great and noble souls who sowed the seeds for the freedom of the Negro slaves. He brought into the world a *concern* for his black brother. No institution ever formed itself about that personality. But a great work of revolution in society was begun, the repercussions of which are felt in society even today. Woolman was a man of humanity, not a man of any clime or time ! Such is the true social worker.

That does not mean that we do not love our own nation—that we are not concerned with our own peculiar problems. One who is not a good citizen of India certainly can never be a citizen of the world. One who does not love the needy at his door cannot love humanity. We shall love our country, demand its freedom, that we may make our own humble gift to Humanity. We shall work for the outcaste in our back yard that all outcastes may be free ! Yes, ours is primarily a ministry of the Spirit, a ministry of Universality, a ministry of the leavening of Humanity if we may say so humbly ! For like the prophet we *know* we have a divine vocation. We have been called to great living. By His

strength our weakness becomes Power !

We, who call ourselves social workers, tend to clutter up the roads to progress. I do not wonder that revolutionary youth become disgusted with us at times. I remember so well a few years ago at Devakottai when wealthy Chettiar women came to my wife for treatment. She soon recognised that what they needed was a radical change of life: a balanced diet, plenty of healthy exercise, etc. But they were not willing to pay the cost of a healthy life. They wanted a short-cut which they felt the doctor could give them. And they were willing to pay plenty of rupees for it ! How easily we could have become parasites on that reactionary community ! We soon learned that *health in India meant generally a revolutionary change in living, not an increase of dispensaries and hospitals, at least of the old type.*

If Mission or other religious institutions could only see how often their own educational institutions hold back educational reform ! How many boys and girls are educated ! Institutions are increased and multiplied. But to what use ? And as the Roman Catholic Church became an obstacle to progress in Spain so such educational institutions often become obstacles to substantial progress in the communities of which they are a part. Our pioneering Mogas and Asansols illustrate well what I mean as to what a revolutionary institution must be. And yet even in such instances one wonders whether they are the instruments of social change that they ought to be.

Village work, village industries, often build into a money economy that makes of the villager a greater slave than he was before. The Village Industries Association, the All-India Village Spinners' Association, have made a remarkable contribution to the Indian village and to Indian economics. We can see how revolutionary they have been when we see their potential resistance to a violent world economy. And yet those of us who work in these movements must ever realise that their task is not done until the world community is changed radically from a money economy to one in which social values will be supreme. In other words, *social workers are revolutionary in their outlook and goal.* And the Gandhi who gives mankind an inspiration towards such a way of life is of the salt of the earth. The institution is but a means to the end. The social worker must be a pioneer of the new order —not a good organiser or institutional man although the latter may well also be a part of his qualifications.

And as our social institutions develop in India, those of us who are called to this special field of service can well check ourselves and our institutions daily to see whether we are merely running and duplicating institutions or whether we are promoting a Way of Life that will bring the riches of Humanity, granted by the Eternal Goodness, to every soul on earth.

RALPH RICHARD KEITHAHN

THE BUDDHIST CONCEPTION OF PERFECTION

[**Dr. Bimala Churn Law,** M.A., B.L., PH.D., D.LITT., F.R.A.S.B. is too well-known a scholar and a specialist in Buddhistic lore to need an introduction to our readers.—ED.]

In Buddhism *Pāramī* or *Pāramitā* means perfection. It is also called *Pāramipattā* or attainment of perfection. It is nothing but a synonym of *Buddhakārakādhammā, i. e.*, the qualities or virtues which tend towards making a Buddha, *i. e.*, maturing the life of a Bodhisattva for the attainment of Buddhahood in his last birth. Precisely in this sense, Dhammapala, a Buddhist commentator, uses the term *Buddhakārakādhammā.*[1] As far back as the second century B. C. *pāramī* was synonymous with *Buddhakārakādhammā* or *Buddhakarā.* In Theravāda Buddhism, the *pāramīs* are ten in number. In the Sanskrit works belonging mostly to the Sarvāstivāda school, the *pāramīs* are six in number. The bulk of later Hinayana Buddhist literature shows predilection for *pāramī* and that of Sanskrit works for *pāramitā.* The ten *pāramīs* mentioned in Theravada are charity (*dāna*), morals (*sīla*), renunciation (*nekkhamma*), determination (*adhiṭṭhāna*), truth (*sacca*), amity (*mettā*), equanimity (*upekkhā*), knowledge (*paññā*), energy (*viriya*) and forbearance (*khanti*). The Buddhavaṃsa of the *Khuddaka-Nikāya* of the *Suṭta-Piṭaka* which is undoubtedly a work of the Pali Canon, makes no mention of the last three *pāramīs.* In Buddhist Sanskrit tradition charity (*dāna*), morals (*sīla*), forbearance (*khanti*), energy (*viriya*) rapt concentration (*dhyāna*) and knowledge (*prajñā*) are recognised. Each of the *pāramīs* or *pāramitās* may be subdivided into (1) the ordinary, (2) the inferior and (3) the unlimited perfection of the virtue. Dr. Barnett in his translation of Śāntideva's *Bodhicaryāvatāra* points out that *dānapāramitā* is not an actual deliverance of the world from poverty but an intention of such deliverance. It is a grace of the spirit. Thus purity of will is the greatest of all virtues and the foundation of all. The perfection of morality (*sīla-pāramitā*) consists essentially in the will to hurt no living being.[2]

Some are of opinion that the conception of six perfections (*pāramitās*) as found mostly in the works of the Sarvāstivāda school was prior in point of time to that of ten *pāramitās* found in Theravada Buddhism.

---

[1] *Cariya-Pitaka Commentary*, P. T. S., p. 8. *Buddhagunanam hetubhuta Buddhakarakadhamma paramiyo aho mahanubhava.*

[2] *The Path of Light*, Wisdom of the East Series, p. 98.

This is incorrect. It should not be forgotten that in earlier Buddhism there is the mention of *dasapāramī*.[1]

A Bodhisattva who is destined to become a Buddha advances in birth after birth to higher and higher sanctity in the practice of the ten perfections until at last he is born as the Buddha, who is omniscient in every possible form (*sarvākārajñatā*), preaching the law and passing away into the everlasting stillness of Nirvāna. In order to attain Bodhi or enlightenment, a Bodhisattva had to exercise the ten *pāramitās* in all the three degrees of their intensity in anterior births. He had to undergo several births to fulfil each *pāramitā*. The Great Sakya Prince, Siddhārtha, before attaining Bodhi found these *pāramitās* to be the only means whereby he could attain the lofty state of a Buddha. Siddhārtha himself attained these *pāramitās*. Bodhisattva Sumedha fulfilled *dāna-pāramitā* by giving in charity all his worldly goods and his own life. Akitti, Saṅkha, Dhananjaya, Sudassana, Mahāgovinda, Nemi, Canda, Sivi and Vessantara made excellent gifts to fulfil the perfection of charity. Sumedha fulfilled *sīla-pāramitā* or the perfection of morals by observing precepts and without taking the least care for his own life. Bhuridatta, Campeyya, Ruru, Mātaṅga, Jayaddisa, Sankhapāla guarded morals at the cost of their own lives. All of them had the strength of morality, well-off and regional (*padesikā*). Sumedha fulfilled *nekkhamma-pāramitā* (the perfection of renunciation) by giving up household life like a prisoner always anxious to be released from the prison. Yudhanjaya, Somanassa, Ayoghara, Bhisa and Sona after giving up riches entered the forest life. Somanassa himself said "I dislike neither the great kingdom nor the enjoyment of pleasures. Omniscience is dear to me, therefore I have given up the kingdom." Sumedha fulfilled *paññā-pāramitā* (perfection of knowledge) by learning whatever he could learn from anybody. He fulfilled *viriya-pāramitā* (perfection of energy) by behaving like a lion, the king of beasts, in all departments; he fulfilled the perfection of forbearance (*khanti-pāramitā*) by bearing all the vicissitudes of life most patiently, like the earth; he fulfilled the perfection of truth (*sacca-pāramitā*) by not telling lies for fear of punishment or for temptation. Sacca, Kaṇhadīpāyaṇa and Sutasoma are the excellent examples of the perfection of truth. To them there was nothing equal to truth. Sacca himself said, "I protected the world with truth and made the people of one accord. There are in this world the virtues of morality, truth, purity and kindness. By this truth, I will make a supreme act of truth." Sumedha fulfilled the perfection of amity (*mettā-pāramitā*) by cherishing love and friendliness towards his

[1] *Cf. Sutta Nipāta*, P. T. S., p. 195. *Jātaka* No. 442, 276, 95, 542, 499, 541, 316, etc., etc., *Digha*, II, *Mahagovinda Suttanta*, etc. etc.

friends and foes alike, like water cooling both the virtuous and the sinner. Besides Sumedha, Sāma and Ekarājā relied much on the power of amity and helped the multitude with the four ways of helpfulness or objects of sympathy, *viz.*, charity, impartiality, justice and kindly speech. He also fulfilled the perfection of equanimity (*upekkhā-pāramitā*) by being indifferent to happiness and suffering like the earth.[1] In one of the Jātaka stories,[2] we read that the Buddha in one of his previous births said, "Bearing patiently happiness and misery, fame and ill-fame, I am balanced in every respect. I am balanced with respect to all and to those who have brought me to pain as well as to those who have given me happiness. I have neither sympathy nor anger."

The Mahayana Buddhist literature is not lacking in information regarding the fulfilment of the *pāramīs* by the Bodhisattva. Aśvaghosa in his *Sraddhotpāda Sūtra* draws our attention to the fact that the Bodhisattvas know that the nature of Dharma is the perfection of spotless charity and they practise the perfection of charity, being free from avarice. They know perfectly well that the nature of Dharma is the perfection of stainless morality, being free from the influence of sensual pleasure and immorality. They practise the perfection of morals, being far above human vices. They realise that the nature of Dharma is the perfection of stainless patience and they, being free from malice, practise the perfection of forbearance. They know that the nature of Dharma is the perfection of pure energy and they practise the perfection of energy, being free from indolence. They practise the perfection of rapt concentration knowing fully well that the nature of Dharma has nothing to do with disturbance and confusion and that it is nothing but the perfection of pure tranquillisation. They practise the perfection of knowledge, knowing fully the nature of Dharma which is nothing but the perfection of pure knowledge, being free from the darkness of ignorance.[3]

The very obligation to accomplish the ten perfections without which the attainment of *mukti* (salvation)[4] is considered impossible by Buddhism is undoubtedly an instance of effort for the sake of duty the motive of which is to practise virtue for the sake of virtue and not for the sake of saving one's own soul or keeping on good terms with a supreme being whose pleasure admits souls into paradise and whose anger hurls them down to hell.[5]

[1] *Cf. Jataka Nidanakatha*, Vol. I; *vide* also B. C. Law, *The Minor Anthologies of the Pali Canon*, Pt. III (Oxford University Press), pp. 95 foll.

[2] *Jataka* No. 94.

[3] Sujuki, *Outlines of Mahayana Buddhism*, p. 69; *The Awakening of Faith in the Mahayana*, pp. 122-23.

[4] It is emancipation, liberation and deliverance. It really means the attainment of the highest state of sanctification by avoidance of the pain and miseries of worldly life.

[5] *Cf.* Christian conception of Duty, *Romans*, XIII, 8-10. Yamakami Sogen, *Systems of Buddhist Thought*, p. 58.

It is clear therefore that the perfections (*pāramitās*) are the excellences of a Bodhisattva who practises the ten virtues. He must fulfil ten *pāramitās* in order to attain enlightenment. The idea of *Pāramitā* is similar in the northern and southern schools of Buddhism with slight variations. It had its root in the old Indian conception of faith[1], particularly as developed in a sutta of the *Majjhima Nikāya*. Its importance lies in its bearing on the problem of the evolution of personality (*pudgala*) whether of the *Buddha*, *Sāvaka* or *Paccekabuddha*[2] type. It is amply exemplified in the *Apadāna*, a work of Hinayana Buddhist literature, that the *Sāvaka-pāramī* (perfection of a disciple) was attained by a large number of men and women as a result of their long efforts. This doctrine had necessarily to lay stress on the prolonged character of the strivings in order to heighten the importance of the moral excellence of the Buddhist personality and, in doing so, it destroyed belief in the immediate prospects held out by Gotama, and transferred the possibility of final fruition to an indefinitely distant date.

BIMALA CHURN LAW

WIPE OUT RACIALISM!

"A Negro Speaks for His People" in the March *Atlantic Monthly* (U.S.A.). Mr. J. Saunders Redding writes that the American Negro in South and North alike is demanding more firmly than ever before "that the rights fundamental to all men shall no longer be denied him."

The policy-making committee of a conference of leading Southern Negroes went on record last December in strong terms against "the principle of compulsory segregation in our American society, whether of races or classes or creeds." Mr. Redding writes:—

> In pledging a war against the Fascist we have pledged to wipe out racialism and the threat of racialism from the earth. We have made the corner of our creed the proposition that men are equal....This is the realistic moral issue. If we evade this issue and win, we are lost—as much as if we lose the military victory....The test of the strength and the durability, the humanity and the godliness, of our way of life is whether we live by it now. This is also the test of the righteousness of the war the peoples wage.... There is no road back from liberalism except to a precipice. The road lies ahead.

[1] Law's *Buddhistic Studies*, pp. 329 foll.

[2] He is inferior to the exalted Buddha. He is not omniscient.

DHARMA AND KARMA IN SHAPING HISTORY

[**Dr. Robert Heilig,** a Professor in the Mysore University Medical College, recognises the fundamental importance of two basic concepts of Indian philosophy. He sees in Dharma and in Karma the keys to happiness and peace for nations as for individuals. It should be the mission of India to help humanity to recognise by mind and practise in action the great ideas enshrined in the words Karma and Dharma; but modern Hindus in the vast majority pay but lip respect to their sacred teachings and their lack of sincerity and assiduity in application in their own lives and to their own problems is the cause of the failure of sister communities like the Muslims, the Parsis, the Jews and the Christians to take full advantage of these true ideas.—ED.]

Every man's attitude towards a catastrophe such as the present world situation depends on two main factors: the individual's answer to the question about the causes of this mass destruction and his expectations for the future, for the post-war world. It is a comparatively simple problem for those millions all over the world for whom Hitler's imperialism is the common denominator of all the devilish machinations which finally culminated in the present conflagration. For these superficial pragmatists the world salvation lies in the removal of the Nazi criminals, their punishment in some conventional, though highly deterrent manner and, finally, in working out a scheme of reconstruction based on formal professions of good-will and mutual understanding, supported by some economic measures of the lease-lend type.

Those who believe in this kind of one-sided responsibility and in the possibility of building up an "organisation" which will guarantee world peace do not realize that whatever has happened in history and whatever will happen as long as humanity exists forms a single chain, the links of which consist of all the deeds and all the thoughts which ever came into the world. One link is formed by each of our actions, the next by its consequences, the reactions of those, living near or far from us in space and time, who are fatefully connected with us. Thus, an endless sequence of causes and effects reaches through all the ages of past, present and future, throughout the ring of Saṃsāra. Those who ignore this fundamental interdependence of deed and fate, which remains the dominant factor throughout the succession of rebirths, are convinced that if Hitler never had been born or if he had been killed in the last war, if the treaty of Versailles had been more lenient or if the British Government had satisfied the Germans by returning their colonies, World War II could have been avoided. It would be maddening, indeed, if such were the springs which move the fate of mankind, if it were impossible to

LIBRARY COPY

find the thread of necessity throughout the succession of events, the totality of which forms world history.

The obvious way to the understanding of the laws of history consists in the application of the old Indian conceptions of karma and dharma to the analysis of historical events. Without recognizing this *leitmotiv*, the development of history would seem to follow the chance distribution of maximum coercion and minimum resistance. Thus no nation ever could be sure of the shortest spell of peaceful existence, not knowing whether it would not be subjected to wanton ruin by the stronger neighbour, the more determined antipode, at any moment. If there is no moral law underlying the rise and decline of communities and empires, then every effort is in vain; enjoying the present, not caring for past and future, is the logical consequence because under this aspect history consists of nothing but kaleidoscopically changing, unrelated, accidental facts, heaped upon each other without any deeper reason.

Contrariwise, taking the view that whatever happens in the world is the lawful consequence of all the preceding deeds of all the individuals ever born, of all the collectivities which have ever existed and that, further, every event which materialises today is in turn the origin of future developments necessarily unfolding out of it, we reach the firm ground of ethics in history. We build on the corner-stone of Indian philosophy, the idea of karma.

Karma, the self-created fate of all living beings, of the whole creation, insures that no deed as no thought which has arisen at any time anywhere in the universe could fade away without producing its consequences, which become manifest in subsequent phases of history. If, for example, one unit of humanity, called a nation, lived on a morally low level at some past time for one or more generations, it follows that due to such conduct an amount of sin, a mass of negative karmic deeds has been accumulated which must cause a period of atonement, of suffering to follow, appearing in history as national defeat, poverty and humiliation; such a strain of misfortune lasts until the right way, the true dharma, is recognized and followed again. The punishing agent does not desist from the purifying inflictions unless all the apparent success, all the wealth and power achieved through a-dharma is virtually or actually destroyed. On the other hand, a human community living for a considerable time according to its dharma necessarily so shapes its own karma that the following generations will reap the benefit until the merits of the preceding good actions are exhausted. This closest interdependence between past and present deeds as well as future fate, between the righteousness of ancestors and the happiness of their descendants, between a-dharmic conduct of life today and otherwise

inexplicable misfortunes in the next or the following generation, lasting until all the misdeeds are atoned for, this chain of mathematical necessity is expressed in a masterly way in the legend of the snake, Death, Time and Karma.[1] The snake which has killed Gautamī's only son pleads not guilty, being only the tool of Death (Mṛtyu), who in turn declares that he has to obey Kāla's command who is ruler of life and death; but Time (Kāla) reveals the eternal truth that neither Kāla nor Mṛtyu nor the snake are to blame for the death of any being. "Karma it is which has driven us to it; there is no other cause of his destruction, only through his own action was he killed," continuing with the profound simile :—

As the potter shapes out of a lump of clay everything he desires, so man attains only that fate which *he has prepared for himself by his action.*

Viewing the historical events of the last ten years in this perspective, the *main problem* is not that of defeating the devilish powers of Hitler and his gang (which comprises most of the Germans) by more bombers, guns, tanks and submarines; such a defeat—necessary though it is from the stand-point of self-preservation—would not alter anything fundamentally. The question which every lover of truth, every one who obeys the command "Know Thyself" has to face is that of realizing *why* the scourge of Nazism and Fascism was sent up from hell to bring inconceivable sorrow over mankind. We are not primarily concerned with the instruments which karma uses to punish us; hating them, taking revenge on them, does not improve our future fate in the least. Unless we imbue our conscience with the fundamental knowledge of the insoluble causal connection between dharma and karma, there is no salvation for us. Unless we have filled our mind, our whole being, with the spiritual experience that there is no injustice in the universe, that every man's fate, good or bad, is a mathematical function of his own deeds or those of his ancestors in Samsāra, unless this realization becomes the sheet-anchor of our view of life, theoretically and *practically,* there is no solution of the world problems to be found, not the slightest possibility that the suffering of mankind can come to an end.

Let us confess how we Westerners lived, we and the generation before us. The sophistic maxim 2300 years old, "Man is the measure of all things," never was so generally accepted as the guiding principle of society as during the last fifty years. It is not meant as a cheap criticism when the leading writers of the post-war generation are pointed out as true mirrors of the life and, more than that, of the spirit from 1918 onwards; what they wrote is a nightmare of concentrated nihilism, crystallized in some works of the most gifted representatives of this over-intellectual, anti-spiritual,

[1] *Mahabharata.* xiii. 1

iconoclastic period, such as those of Aldous Huxley (before his conversion), Alfred Doeblin's *Berlin Alexanderplatz*, Erich Kaestner's *Fabian*, the whole *œuvre* of John Dos Passos or Ernest Hemingway's *Fiesta*. On a lower plane we find the same atmosphere created in Hollywood with its amazing influence, all over the world, on the conceptions of social ethics and artistic taste. These books and films emanate dark clouds of selfishness, of an individualism which is a fatal caricature of itself not only because it denies all obligations towards family, society and culture-preserving tradition but also because it even ignores any duty of the individual towards its real Self; because it overlooks entirely that pleasure-seeking desires, the craving for sense satisfaction are the lowest stratum of the ego, that part of it which automatically is sublimated by every honest attempt towards perfection, every real interest in the eternal values of a spiritual life. We do not mean to say that mankind should lead an ascetic life, doing tapas in forest ashramas; but it should be emphasized that the only way out of the present state of millionfold fratricide is the realization that nothing but the sincere and lifelong continued attempt to recognize one's own dharma and to act according to it could change our present karma of desperate misfortune to one of hopeful, dignified existence. Such a change could be achieved only by fighting hard and strenuously against our own tamasic tendencies which are so stubborn and strong because our whole historical period belongs to the sphere of tamas.

History shows that whenever a society or a state dominated by tamas has come into conflict with one ruled by rajasic elements, the first has been defeated, almost without a struggle. The corrupt Greek city states of the fourth century B.C. as well as the Persian monarchy, undermined by selfish intrigues which had destroyed all but an empty gilded hull of the King's godlike position, fell like overripe fruit into the hands of the Macedonians; but when Alexander the Great thought of preparing the same fate for the Mauryan Empire, suddenly his power failed; certainly not only due to Chandragupta's elephants or to the strained lines of communication, but because of the sattvic atmosphere which pervaded India 160 years after the death of Buddha,[1] and some years prior to Buddhism's becoming the state religion under Asoka.

The Roman Empire, a political structure unsurpassed in might up to the last century, disintegrated because it was defenceless, incapable of resistance from inside. As long as dharma was a living power in Rome, she was the mistress of the

[1] The spirit of worldly cleverness which dominates Kautiliya's *Arthasastra* so little fits into this age that it is a great satisfaction to find this work placed by leading scholars in the third or fourth century A.D. *Cf.* M. WINTERNITZ, *History of Indian Literature*, Vol. I, p. 519 (University of Calcutta, 1927)

world. When the narrow-minded presumption of the ruling (moneyed, tamasic) classes denied the right of citizenship to the peoples of the provinces, when the peasant became a despised, rightless slave, then the youthful hordes of the barbarians easily overpowered the colossus which was living then in a-dharma, thus creating its karma of "decline and fall."

What is the secret of Mohamed's spectacular successes? He conceived a great synthesis of devotion to God and the ideals of the Kshattriya; he taught a new form of dharma, strictly defining the sum total of the duties of his followers, rajasic in principle but blended with a strongly idealistic, unselfish factor. As long as his commands were obeyed, as his conception of dharma guided the life of the nations which his faith had created, they flourished in mighty kingdoms, which for many centuries were the protectors and the only refuge of culture and human happiness on earth. Countless instances could be quoted throughout the centuries proving that a human society, a nation or a state lives in comparative happiness and balanced prosperity only owing to its karma, its self-created fate, which is favourable and benevolent just so long as it is supported by righteousness.

One of the most convincing examples in recent history seems to be the creation of the United States of North America out of the Civil War (1861-1864). All the obvious advantages, military power, trained leaders and strategists fought for the Confederates, the slave-holders, all the initial success was with them; the Unionists had no organization, no warrior-minded aristocrats but they had strong faith in human rights, enthusiastic devotion to a high mission—the liberation of the Negro slaves—and their ideals were personified in one of the few really great men whom the West has seen during the last centuries, a pure, unselfish servant of the spirit of humanity, Abraham Lincoln. And so the righteous cause triumphed, though Lincoln was assassinated by the jealous forces of darkness when his aim was achieved. But the karma formed by his heroic effort to make his nation fulfil its dharma, hard and full of sacrifices though this way was, materialized in the unparalleled rise of the U. S. A. to its present position. Its future fate depends upon the balance of good and bad deeds accumulated since those glorious days eighty years ago. These facts show that success is not with the better arms but with those living and working in the better spirit.

As in the case of an individual, wherever a nation is placed owing to the karma which results from all its previous deeds—intended and performed—there it has to do its duty, living in dharma and thus, playing its part according to the plan of the universe, contributing to the harmony of the creation. This duty varies according to the requirements of the historical period, the age of

the nation, its predominant gifts and many other factors. A youthful nation is bent on organizing the national life by framing the rules within which the community can best develop its innate potentialities; the art created in this stage expresses the strong collectivist tendencies of such a society, being monumental, architectonic, renouncing all cheap effects of picturesque whims, striving to materialise the beauty of eternal necessity, of mathematical law. It is the time when the spiritual experience of a race is codified in holy scriptures, supposed to be God's own Word, revealed to those who have ears to hear; it would not fit the anti-individualistic trends of such a period to recognize the Rishis as the authors, the founders of the religious system; they are the instruments in tune with God's wisdom, they only speak out the divine truth which has no beginning and no end. The oldest parts of the Vedas, the Avesta, the Old Testament are the supreme manifestations of this stage, though separated from each other by centuries in absolute chronology.

If a people has lived according to its dharma, obeying and fulfilling its commandments whether they lead to the loftiest heights of spirituality or to the most austere tasks performed in the sense of the *Gītā*, the spirit of detachment, then the national karma becomes fortunate; a happy fate leads to the full development of the next stage. Otherwise, if the nation has been bound in tamasic inertia, devoted to sensual enjoyment, to gluttony in every sense, proving its unworthiness to survive, it is wiped out by the hostile neighbour whom karma chooses as the executor of its command. Such an aggressor may be as ruthless as those he destroys have been; he will not escape his own karma; but at a given historical moment he is used to carry out a fateful punishment, according to the Law of History.

Only a few words need be added about the further events which form a fully unfolding national life. It is characterised by a slowly increasing accentuation of man as an individual with problems of his own, independent of those of the community. In India the Upanisadic age follows that of the Vedas. The deepest thinkers whom mankind has ever brought forth dived through all the hidden spheres of interrelationship between man, the individual soul, and Brahman, the all-embracing eternal. A perfect balance was worked out in this period, which finds its parallels in the wonderful achievements of pre-sophistic Greece and the height of European Gothic, between the liberty of the individual to explore the complex wealth of his own personality and the rightful demands of the community.

The reason why no nation has been able to go on living in such a cultural and social paradise is the fact, deeply rooted in human nature, that selfishness, greed and short-sighted striving for the satisfaction of tamasic (or at the best rajasic) tendencies have always become

predominant as soon as perfection seemed attained and thus has spoiled the karma of every society in history. The conduct of life under the influence of antisocial elements is one of a-dharma ; and of a-dharma the sage said that whoever is guided by it may acquire wealth, may be successful in the battle, may defeat his enemies but he shall perish at his roots.[1]

This seems to be the explanation of the fate of nations in the third stage of development, where art and technique compete in making everyday life easy and pleasant for those who "can afford" it. But what use have these civilizations made of the saved energies, the expanded leisure time ? Art without any appeal to man's divine soul, literature which stirred the lowest instincts, entertainment which pursued one single aim : distraction from every serious thought, every nobler feeling ; these were the achievements of post-war society in the West. None of the moral bonds remained in force. The sophistic doctrine of "what pleases is allowed" became the motto of our generation in the nineteen-twenties and remained in force until every trace of individual liberty was stamped out by the Fascist-Nazi régime, the inevitable reaction of deifying the collective against an unfettered individualism which had abandoned itself to an uprooted intellectualism, to dissolute sensuality.

Does anybody honestly, seriously, think that the destruction of the Nazi scourge, which is nothing but Fate's lashing whip, would redeem this world, which has lost the way of dharma ? Does not the idea of karma, the only one which shows the real sense, the ultimate cause of historical events, prove beyond doubt that we can find salvation only by reforming ourselves ? Unless we create a more favourable karma for our generation and for those who follow us, unless we find again the threefold path of dharma and tread it humbly, bent on duty, no victory in the field can alter the ultimate fate of humanity. Redemption from evil cannot be attained by crushing the evil personified in others, unless we have exterminated it in ourselves.

The same principle applies to all the conflicts which poison the relationship of nations. India has been fighting for freedom, for national independence, for the last hundred years. From Raja Ram Mohan Roy to Mahatma Gandhi, leaders of world importance have been born to her. And yet, this aim will not be achieved *unless the millions of this country have hammered out their karma, leading to national success, by recognizing the human rights of their own brothers and sisters, by abolishing discrimination between various castes and conceding a legal position, of which Hinduism need not be ashamed, to women in general and*

[1] Quoted by Rabindranath Tagore in *Civilization and Progress*, a lecture delivered in China, 1924.

widows in particular. So long as castes and communities through fighting among themselves exhaust the best part of their energies in securing living space for national minorities or certain castes, which outside this country only the most hostile parties deny each other, so long as India does not live in dharma, so long must karma refuse what the people cherish most.

Summarising what a synthetic view of karma and dharma in the course of history teaches, it should be emphasized that unconditional surrender and lasting disarmament of the Nazis and their satellites are necessary to attaining some breathing space for the tyrannized-over world. But even complete destruction of this murderous scourge would not bring the world nearer to salvation, if this breathing space be not used entirely to acquire merit weighty enough to turn the unfortunate karma of the oppressed or threatened nations to one of dignified happiness. All those who are prepared to devote their life to building up a better future, who fervently hope that World War III can be avoided and who feel that this aim has to be achieved at all costs, all those must realize that one and only one way is open which leads to this goal, the way of dharma. This way is pointed out in the imperishable words of the *Bhagavad-Gītā:* "Your duty is but to act, never to be concerned with results; so let not the fruit of action be your motive. Do not let yourself be drawn into the path of non-action."[1] But this imperative call to unattached activity needs a corollary on the plane of eternally unchanging ethics. When the demon-king asks his son Prahlada, the great devotee of Vishnu, to reveal the roots of his power, which triumphs over all the might of darkness, Prahlada says:—

He who meditates not of wrong to others, but considers them as himself, is free from the effects of sin, inasmuch as the cause does not exist; but he who inflicts pain upon others, in act, thought or speech, sows the seed of future birth, and the fruit that awaits him after birth is pain. I wish no evil to any and do and speak no offence; for I behold God in all beings, as in my own soul.[2]

ROBERT HEILIG

[1] *Bhagavad-Gita.* II. 47

[2] *Vishnu-Purana.* I. 19, 1-9.

THE SPIRAL OF BEAUTY

[**Dr. K. R. Srinivasa Iyengar** of the Lingaraj College, Belgaum, author of *Lytton Strachey: A Critical Study* and *Indo-Anglian Literature*, finds mere physical beauty at the very bottom of the "Spiral of Beauty" and Nirvana as its highest consummation.—ED.]

We generally use the word "beautiful" merely qualitatively. We say that a lonely crocus is beautiful; we also say that the Peredeniya Gardens are beautiful. A group of five simple words, "She should have died hereafter," is beautiful; Shakespeare's *Macbeth* is also beautiful. Speaking of a woman we say: she has beautiful eyes; she has a beautiful bearing; she lives a beautiful life. Aren't there gradations in beauty? Isn't there greater as opposed to lesser beauty? Isn't there a spiral of beauty? If there is, on what basis do we find that one object, A, is not only beautiful in itself but that it is also more beautiful than another object, B? And, granted our spiral, our scale of values, what is its dizzy peak, the quintessence of beauty?

Beauty is ever a kind of equation, a sort of balance effected between seeming opposites like law and impulse, unity and diversity, form and disorder, the one and the many. The wider the disagreement on the basis of which the agreement is reared—the larger the number of details on which the logic of form imposes its unity—the greater is the triumph of form, the greater the resulting beauty. Thus, *King Lear* is a greater, a more beautiful work than *Romeo and Juliet; The Divine Comedy* is greater than *Paradise Lost* and Kalidasa's *Sakuntala* is greater and more beautiful than any even of Shakespeare's great tragedies. Youth and age, the young year's blossoms and the fruits of its decline, the sensibility and the passion of youth, the sober wisdom and the enduring love of confident maturity, these are harmoniously blended in *Sakuntala*. Frustration gives way to fulfilment; the agitations and the agonies of youth give way to reunion and tranquillity and serene joy is the word for all. Tragedies, while they no doubt profoundly move us, but affirm the everlasting no; the everlasting yea is but indirectly, if at all, insinuated. But a "divine comedy" like Dante's or Kalidasa's, for all its suggestion of the infinite perturbations and defeats of life, yet triumphantly and directly affirms the everlasting yea. A balance is effected even between evil and good, sorrow and happiness; and its almost unearthly beauty—for such felicity is, we believe, not of this earth—exalts us and ennobles us. That is why a play like *Sakuntala*, bridging as it does earth and heaven, shines almost alone, a star.

In evaluating whether an object or a work of art is beautiful, it is useful to bear in mind three "laws"

of beauty; (1) that only is truly beautiful that is beautiful from all angles; (2) that only is truly beautiful that is beautiful to all men; (3) that only is truly beautiful that is beautiful at all times and for all time.

Plays like *Sakuntala* and *Hamlet* and *Faust*, works of architecture like the Taj Mahal, St. Peter's at Rome, and the Chartres Cathedral, pictures like Mona Lisa, a fresco painting in Ajanta, a symphony of Beethoven's or a *kriti* of Tyagaraja's, these have moved the hearts of men and women for several centuries past and have become in consequence constituents of our cultural heritage. Take the Taj, for instance; it strikes the beholder differently at different times, in different seasons, from different angles; but beautiful it always is. So with *Hamlet* and *Sakuntala* and the rest. We read a play or a poem, we hear a song, we gaze intently at a building or at a picture; and every time we do so, we seem to discover something new, we plumb new depths or scale new heights; our sense of its beauty is quickened and enriched and we seem at last to catch the full significance of Keats's asseveration: "A thing of beauty is a joy for ever!"

From the foregoing it must be clear that mere physical beauty, being subject to decay, is not the main thing. It is rather almost at the very bottom of the spiral of beauty. Desdemona cared not for Othello's appearance but saw "his visage in his mind." Indian Art, again, presents only symbolic beauty; in Sri Aurobindo's words,

> always one has to look not at the form, but through and into it, to see that which has seized and informed it. The appeal of this art is in fact to the human soul for communion with the divine soul and not merely to the understanding, the imagination and the sensuous eye.

When physical beauty is not the house of virtue but of vice, then beauty but side-tracks the beholder, confounds and saddens him. Since in the appreciation of beauty sensory and intellectual faculties both play a part, it is not possible, while remembering that a woman like Medea is beautiful, to forget that at the same time she is also a tigress; or to forget the fact that a building, however incontestably attractive outwardly, houses an abattoir. As Shakespeare says:—

> In nature there's no blemish but the mind;
> None can be called deformed but the unkind:
> Virtue is beauty, but the beauteous evil
> Are empty trunks o'erflourished by the devil.

An aged statesman, grown grey in the service of his country, is no less beautiful—if not more so—than a veritable young Adonis who is the world tennis champion. Rightly has it been said:—

> The glory of young men is their strength;
> And the beauty of old men is the hoary head.

Similarly, a dying old woman, even at the moment of death transfigured by her love for her children and grandchildren; a city in ruins, in the very ruins giving intimations of its vanished splendours; these too are beautiful, had we the understanding to piece out their beauty.

When physical beauty is thus transfigured by the mind—by the very soul—that inhabits the physical frame, then is it true beauty indeed, and age cannot wither it, nor custom stale its infinite variety.

A final question: If beauty is a sort of equation, which is the most comprehensive equation of all? Which radiant beauty shines upon the very summit of our spiral of beauty? Can we, dare we, see it, and be un-blinded yet?

A counter-question: Why do we, so tirelessly and so restlessly, seek beauty in life and in art? For a very simple reason—we want to be happy. We are ever unhappy, for one reason or another, in one way or another—and we desperately want to break through the shell, the many concentric shells, of unhappiness to reach the felicity that beckons to us from afar. We are unhappy because of ugliness, of disorder, of chaos; we feel that we are isolated specks in an alien world; we are almost crushed by our unescapable sense of loneliness. As we make contact with beauty, we feel that the terrible burden of this unintelligible world is somewhat lightened, and we are emboldened to scale the further heights of beauty and of happiness.

But the heart's insistent questions will not be stilled yet. However pleasurable our contacts with beauty may be—however we move higher up the spiral, touching, one by one, beauty of mere form, beauty of good manners, beauty of service, beauty of renunciation and beauty of holiness—we are able to forget only for a little while our feeling of isolation, of separation, this feeling of being divided into an insignificant nothing by the sheer pressure of a million dichotomies. Is life worth living? What are we—we the atomic individuals—doing here, "here, upon this bank and shoal of time"? Is there nothing serious in mortality? Is life no more than toys? Do we come here merely to sit and hear each other groan? Does Life offer —only sharply to deny? What is all enjoyment of beauty worth if so soon yet another dichotomy can thus sting us into despair?

After all, consubstantiality plays its part. Duryodhana could not find ten good people in the whole wide world, just as Yudhishtira could not find ten bad people in the same wide world. Similarly, it is only when we have cultivated beauty within, and only to the extent that we have cultivated it, that we can recognize it in the outside world. If there is harmony within, it will be seen to rule the universe as well. To Sri Aurobindo the universe itself is an ecstatic dance—

> the dance of Shiva which multiplies the body of God numberlessly to the view: it leaves that white radiance precisely where and what it was, ever is and ever will be; its sole absolute object is the joy of the dancing.

To Ramanuja, again, world-existence is but Narayana's *lila;* He is both *swayam* and swasmin. The sages and seers of India have thus

been able to seize by direct vision the greatest equation of all: that the microcosm *is* the macrocosm. *Aham brahmosmi* is an equation certainly—even if it is not quite the identity of Shankara's conception. There is, let us suppose, a vast canvas, pale blue painted; and at the centre, or almost at the centre, a bright dot, hardly more than a dot, representing the moon. Don't we grasp the balance effected in the picture, don't we apprehend its ineffable beauty? Do we not seem, as it were, to grasp the transcendent beauty of the Infinite sky through a piercing perception of the beauty of the seemingly finite moon? This beauty—the beauty of the final equation of all—is the highest beauty as it is the ultimate truth; it may be called variously the beauty of *nirvana*, of *bayalu nirbayalu*, of *shanti*, of the Bliss of Brahman; it is an integration of all other beauties, all other truths. But this beauty, this truth, cannot be argued out; it cannot be demonstrated in a laboratory; it has only to be experienced—and, perhaps, not for us mere terrestrial men is this untranslatable experience. But it is there—so the wise men of all times tell us; it is the dizzy peak of the spiral; it is absolute beauty blended with absolute goodness and absolute truth, the formal, the functional and the quintessential aspects of the One held in a final synthesis. It was, perhaps, a dim recognition of this that inspired Keats to conclude his famous Ode with the oft-quoted lines:—

'Beauty is truth, truth beauty,'—that is all
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know!

K. R. SRINIVASA IYENGAR

So when we talk in future of Freedom, let us think. Freedom for whom? For ourselves? For our own little set? For those whose opinions and traditions are similar to our own? Freedom for Britain? For our Empire? For those who speak our language, believe in our creed, wear a white skin?...Let us never forget that the people of China, yes, and negroes, too, are fighting on the side of the United Nations....Therefore it is up to us to widen our vision. To open our minds and learn. To open our hearts and see to it that we ourselves sow kindly and tolerant seeds of Freedom, for remember:

"There is one Race the world over,
And that Race is named Man;
Nursed at the breast of the same Mother Earth
The same sun and moon are our comrades."

And the spirit of Goodwill, the force of Friendship, will, I believe, together take us a long way towards the eternal Spring of international understanding.

JULIA CAIRNS

LIBRARY COPY

NEW BOOKS AND OLD

INDIAN LITERATURE : ITS FUTURE

The future of Indian literature should deeply engage the attention of those who are genuinely interested in India. Less dramatically than Indian politics, but as significantly, less fundamentally, but more excitingly than Indian economics, Indian literature is undergoing changes under the stress of the war. These have occurred in forms and contents and also in the personal and impersonal attitudes of those sections among the Indian writers who are likely to survive the longest after the War. Some of the changes are opportunities which can be ignored only at the peril of the Indian culture, while others contain evil possibilities needing utmost vigilance from now.

Before, however, we take stock, the supreme *fact* of the oneness of Indian literature may be asserted. If, in spite of sharp nationalisms and differences in race and in political and economic development, there is a definite European literary tradition which binds the French, the Italian and the Spanish traditions into a Latin-Catholic-Mediterranean group, on the one hand, and the English, the German and the Scandinavian into a Northern-Protestant group on the other, and if that European tradition then eventually comprehends both the groups and brings the rest within the larger orbit, then the presumption of a whole common corpus of Indian literary traditions, derived from Sanskrit and instinct with the Hindu-Buddhist-Islamic heritage and enriched by the Western influence, must seem strong to those who are not deliberately blind to or are not blinded by the bright immediacy of this idea of oneness. Needless to say, the unity of Indian literary traditions is a plural unity, and its reality is of the order of what Miss Fallet calls the Concrete Universal, but emerging through "crises" in the historical process.

The common Indian literary traditions are more than a parallel presumption. They actually cut across the regional literatures and decide some of the basic stimuli and responses of writers and readers. In fact, the commonness is so implicit that it has lost its markedness except when it is up against another specific tradition. Take love, which is the staple food of literature. In the European tradition, love is informed by passion, as Rougement in his *Passion and Society* has shown. Contrasted with that passionate love, the Sanskrit, Hindi, Urdu or Bengali treatment of love is literary to the point of sophistication. The Vaishnavas, who should have known better, have etherealised "passion" beyond human redemption. Even in the best Urdu love-poems, wit displaces the urgencies of this world and makes of love an exercise in "conceit." As in love, so in regard to the individual man and woman. It is strange but true that even in the novels and dramas of Tagore, and they were conceived in the period of developed individualism, very few "characters" are individuals in the European

LIBRARY COPY

sense of the term. The main line of Indian literature has avoided "passion" and "character" in its preoccupation with its own world-view, in which such things are on a lower plane. Which also explains why "character," if not "passion," is to be found here, if at all, among folk-tales and legend cycles.

Probably, the point of view of the "historical process" gives a better understanding of the fact of unity. The forces behind the process can be classified into two types: (a) the literary, and (b) the non-literary. The literary ones refer to sources and influences. It is well known that all the important Indian literatures, with the probable exception of Urdu, had their first resurgence under the influence of the Bhakti cult, and their second birth in the beginning of the nineteenth century, when Western learning opened a new window and made Indian writers look out into the broad vistas of "romance" and "scientific reason." The varying tempo of adjustment to Western ideas, no doubt, graded the literary quality in the initial stages, but the total impact was a great leveller indeed. Whatever differences exist in the outlooks of one modern Indian literature and another may be reduced to the time-scale of assimilation of the Western influence. If Hindi literature absorbed the Western ideas earlier than the Urdu or, what comes to the same thing, if Urdu literature stuck to the older formalities with greater persistence than the Hindi, or if Bengali literature was the first to store away its inheritance and acquire the New Learning, it would not abolish the basic datum of all regional or communitarian types being revivified by the incidence of Western ideas as communicated through the English language. The extraordinary number of translations of English classics, the preponderance of a rational outlook and a romantic angle towards love, the revolt against social injunctions, a sense of social maladjustment and a desire for revaluation are features common to all the Indian literatures of the nineteenth century. Even when the reaction set in, the nationalist approach was only mechanically opposed to the indiscriminate adoption of the Western modes of thought and living. Attempts were made to culture the indigenous, but they came to nought in nearly all cases. Between the original synthetic impetus of the Bhakti cult and the secondary, eclectic contact with the West, the capital uniformity of the various modern Indian literary traditions was processed. And then, in the last thirty years, Tagore strode all local literatures like the Colossus. His Bengali was no bar to his all-India hold. His works are centripetal for Indian culture.

These literary sources and influences, hastily sketched, may be described as the epi-phenomena of certain non-literary, material conditions of living in India. There seems to have been a faint, long-period correlation between politico-economic disturbances and literary upheavals in the past; from the nineteenth century, the connection becomes manifest, until, at last, in this century, it becomes close. Round about the eighties of the last century, the feeling of political disillusionment began to grow, and nationalism came in its wake. The new landed and professional interests were at last formed into a class which defeated the

original reasons for its existence by the help of democratic ideas and a general acquaintance with the defects of the Western civilisation. Probably, the content of this nationalism was more imitative than positive; it may as well be that from then on the Muslim intelligentsia began to be suspicious of the nationalist intentions; yet the interests of the middle class *vis-à-vis* the Indian administration covered the deficiencies in the unity, and made for a fair degree of uniformity in the contents of literature, subject to the varying degree of contact with the West through the administration. The literature of this epoch was the creation of the salariat, *i. e.*, the government servants, and reflected their "legitimate" hopes about the future political and social status of India. Hardly any hope, any attitude of this age could be called specifically Bengali or Marhatti, Hindi or Urdu. In fact, the sketches of travels, the mutual renderings of stories, myths and legends, the ignorance of the folk-literature, the imitation and the adoption of English literary ways and manners were features common to all. Indian society had thrown up a new class that wanted to make up for its un-rootedness by its loud protests of Indian-ness no less than by its hectic search for props in the West.

Once the unity of modern Indian literary traditions is appreciated from the stand-point of the historical process, the changes which are taking place in the Indian literary forms and contents during these war years may be appraised. The first noticeable change, for obvious reasons, is the absence of songs, poems and novels built round the struggle for political freedom. These have long occupied an honoured place in modern Indian literature. The vacuum, however, is being filled with the literature of another type of freedom, *viz.*, the socio-economic. The last two years, during which the Soviet Government has become the ally of the British, have witnessed a phenomenal increase in what is called Marxist literature. Young men and women seem to have discovered the Promised Land in Russia and are using Marxist terms with abandon. It is not difficult to detect the elements of faith and the proofs of loose thinking in such uses, but a serious student of literature cannot but observe there in transference, projection, rationalisation and sublimation, in fact, all the techniques by which the mind of man helps to preserve human integrity.

Probably, the Marxist tendencies are something more than a symptom of self-preservation; they are the pointer-readings of a progress in our literary attitudes, which, as is well-known, had a blind-spot in regard to the life of the people. None can forecast the future of Indian Marxist literature; after the war, the whole thing may be banned; but, sooner or later, it will stage a come-back in a shape more Indian and less foreign. Then the problem will arise of mutual adjustment between the nationalist and the socialist attitudes. A bigger dose of nationalism may vitally modify the international outlook of socialism, provided the social changes promised by this war fail, that is to say, succeed in further aggravating the anti-British attitude through a process of unemployment, business crises and trade restrictions. As these are not unlikely post-war phenomena, the interests of a healthy

development of Indian literature demand a careful fostering of the economic interpretations and the internationalism they lead to. Thus it is that the brilliant prognosis by Dr. Kohn-Bramstedt in THE ARYAN PATH for April 1943 of the function of the social novel of today and tomorrow does not strictly hold good of the Indian case. Most of the major Indian social symptoms move against such attitudes of international co-operation as he would wish and drive towards the "madness of perverted nationalism," as all sane men would hate to have them do.

Excluding the Marxist literary attitudes, there are at least two other agencies which, under proper guidance, may favour the future Indian literature. The first is the general feeling of revolt which the Congress movement has generated, and the second is the consequential sense of dissatisfaction with mere political action which that has occasioned. After the war, when some form of national government will have appeared, Indian novels are likely to record deeds of "rebellion" and acts of "heroism." Simultaneously, disillusionment will also raise its head and seek new avenues of satisfaction for the patriotic impulses. The avenues, when they are not Marxist, may as well be better sex and family adjustment, and a recrudescence of religious faith. It does not require a prophet to predict that Indian literature is likely to be split up into two hostile camps, one, the sociological, materialistic and socialistic, the other the metaphysical, idealistic and traditional. The second camp need not be that of the anti- or the counter-revolutionaries. Informed by scholarship and the pragmatic sense, it may correct the ignorance and the unreality of the Indian Marxist literature in regard to Indian culture and the weight of its incidence. Similarly, the first camp may have all the fervour of a religion.

In between these two schools, we may have reportage, travel diaries, poems and so on; but in so far as their literary quality is independent of social attitudes, their values will not affect their readers sufficiently to be noticed in any sociological account. In a sense, they may be the only "literature," but in view of the fact that active war service has not attracted the "right type" of Indians in any large numbers, the prospects in India of a pure war literature with adventure, heroism in the face of death, discipline and efficiency, are small indeed. If the English literature of the next few years is going to be mainly the pilot's and the sea-captain's affair, it can be understood why the Indian literature of the same period is going to be comparatively weak in character and strong in ideologies.

The present status of the Hindi as against the Urdu literature appears to thwart the above prognosis. For one thing, Hindi and Urdu had been drifting apart for quite a long time before the war started, and for another, the non-participation of the Muslim League in the political movement had denied a section of the educated Muslims the benefit of the experience that could form the subject-matter of the new literature. At the same time, the following considerations are real: There is a large number of Muslims among the Communists who are most making the literary experiments; moreover, the alleged absence of

"patriotic" feeling among the Muslims and the Communists is not borne out either by statistics or by observation. And then, just under the pressure of the war, the work of various nationalist organisations that had addressed themselves to the task of creating a Hindusthani language out of Hindi and Urdu is being actively pursued, though with different motives, by the All-India Radio and the Information Departments. If we add the Hindusthani of the Talkies to the above, we need not despair of the separatist literary tendencies on the basis of religious communities and their linguistic or cultural differences. Much will depend upon the Congress-League *rapport,* but the influx of youthful members into the latter is a hopeful sign for Indian literature. The evolution of the Indian literary traditions calls for an understanding between these two organisations. If there is no understanding, the unity of the Indian literature, forged with such patience by the historical process, will be broken to bits, and the broader issue of Indian culture will go by default.

The modes of living of present-day writers are no less important than the wider possibilities. Today a number of writers are in jail or otherwise silent, while others are in the Information Departments or in journalism. Which only means that "literary" activity is not brisk, and "propaganda" is current. But when we remember that before the war learned men were becoming authors, the lessons of journalistic propaganda may not all be to the bad for literature. Besides, on comparison, one notices greater conviction in modern journalistic writing; it is probably stronger against the Fascist than for the British; but the conviction is there for all to see. Be that as it may, the writers' habit of looking up to the administration for maintenance is going to survive. And every consideration supports the justice of that claim. Thanks to the paper shortage and the soaring prices, the independent writers are in a miserable condition, and it is touch-and-go for them to be Marxist or Fascist. Probably the chances of Fascism are greater in misery than in prosperity. Once that tendency gets a chance, the broad vision of the Indian literature will be restricted. Only a national government can check this ugly tendency and preserve that great tradition of internationalism which eminent Indians from Raja Ram Mohan to Tagore and Pandit Jawahar Lal have fostered with all their creative energies.

To conclude: Indian literature is going to be more sociological than purely literary. The sociological approach may be Marxist-internationalist or Fascist-patriotic. The first tendency is likely to lead to experiments, and the second may end in traditionalism and increasing separation between Hindi and Urdu. Marxism will naturally be materialistic, but against it will mainly work the theological inheritance and the religious traditions of Hindus and Muslims. For the Muslim writers, however, their roots in the Islamic democracy and their burning faith in the future will have a countervailing effect upon their theology. The patriotic fervour among Hindus being stronger than desire for change of the social order, Marxist Indian literature will not go down with Hindu readers easily, unless the jargon is religiously abjured.

That done, the Marxist Indian literature becomes equal to the people's literature. Only that can abolish the Hindu-Muslim separatism in literary traditions, and purify patriotism of its Fascist predilections. But there, again, only a national government can create the necessary conditions for such a literature. Till then, all the inner resources of India should be tapped to prevent frustration from slithering into the romantic, slave-worthy cult of race and the Super-Man.

D. P. MUKERJI

THE LINGAYAT CREED*

This annotated recension of a Sanskrit work of the seventeenth-century writer Nandikeshwara explains the importance and the significance of the wearing and worshipping of the "linga" by followers of the Lingayat religion. It is published here with an English translation and a 682-page Introduction. The editor has taken great pains in compiling this Introduction, which deals with the history and the philosophy of the religion.

It has been commonly accepted that Virasaivism was revived late in the eleventh century as a protestant movement against the empty ritual and formalism of contemporary religious practice. With the inspired advocacy of ardent seekers after spiritual truth like Basava, the reformist movement succeeded in evolving a direct and simplified form of religion—Virasaivism. Disregarding the limitations of caste, sex, creed or condition in life, a broad eclectic and democratic faith with insistence on Bhakti was the fruit of this mediæval religious ferment. Since then, the fundamentals of the faith have been restated by many writers, of whom Nandikeshwara was one.

It is now accepted also that Basava was not the founder of Virasaivism. But Shri Sakhare maintains that Basava was the founder, in the face of weighty opinions like those expressed by Dr. Nandimath. In fact Basava put so much life into the religion by his teachings that his over-enthusiastic admirers have ever sought to credit him with foundation of the faith, in spite of the now discovered works and activities of earlier saints like Revanasiddha, Ekorama, etc. The early history of the religion is shrouded in impenetrable obscurity. No authoritative work on the subject written before the eleventh century is extant. In the light of recent historical research and particularly on the evidence of the Mohenjo-Daro finds, it has been assumed generally that Siva worship extends back to the Indus Valley civilisation. It has seemed probable that it may date back even to the pre-Aryan culture of the ancient Dravidians.

It is Shri Sakhare's thesis in his Introduction that later Shaivism is traceable to ancient Dravidian or pre-Aryan forms of worship. He argues that it has developed through the ages side by side with the Vedic cults of sacrifice and worship. He declares that the *Agamas* claimed as scripture by the

* *History and Philosophy of Lingayat Religion. (Being an Introduction to) Lingadharanachandrika of Nandikeshwara.* Edited by M. R. SAKHARE, M. A., T. D. (Cantab.). (Published by the Author from 134, Thalakwadi P. O. Belgaum. Rs. 15/-)

Lingayats embody principles and rituals opposed to Vedic injunctions and akin to ancient Tamilian tradition. He claims for the *Agamas* an authority and a status equal to those of the *Vedas*. He sees the *Agamas* as the products of Dravidian culture of a period when the Aryan influence was either not felt or had not been assimilated. Unless by all this Shri Sakhare means to suggest by implication that Lingayatism took its rise in pre-Aryan Dravidian culture, was independent of Vedic influences and existed and developed simultaneously but separately through the ages, all the ancient history extending over hundreds of pages is thrown out of focus and will have to be deemed entirely unnecessary.

With the indeterminate character of our ancient chronology and the hypothetical nature of the conclusions which research with respect to the *Agamas* has yielded, Shri Sakhare's conclusions about the influence of the *Agamas* on works like the *Gita* and on religious practice generally must be deemed only tentative. Unless corroborated by further research about their origin and their authority, it is difficult to accept the inferences. Such a statement as that the *Gita* enjoined a turning away from the *Vedas* and the *Upanishads*, that in fact the *Gita* contradicts their teachings, is hard to swallow.

All that may be legitimately concluded, and that tentatively, from the nature of the evidence tendered, is that traces of worship of a Deity akin to Siva have very long persisted in a variety of forms and under different names. It is only by implication and analogy that the "Supreme Being" of the ancient Dravidian writings on the seals at Mohenjo-Daro and that of the Rigvedic period, has been identified with Siva inasmuch as the name "Siva" occurs in neither. Certain links in the chain are too weak and slender to bear the weight of historical proof that is hung upon them. The theistic partialities of early Shaivism and the symbolical character of the "lingam," the wearing and worshipping of which are important practices of the religion, also tell a different story.

The exposition of the principles and the philosophy of the religion is erudite and informative. Prescribing a definite mode of conduct and accepting gradualism as a principle of spiritual realisation, Lingayatism claims attention as an individual branch of Indian thought. Two principles which underlie the practice of the religion must be specially commended. Lingayatism, disregarding artificial barriers between man and man, stands for universal brotherhood. And it prescribes no ascetic turning away from life but recognises the possibility of spiritual realisation in the world.

While it cannot be denied that the author has laboured much in compiling the Introduction the reader cannot escape the idea that the work could have been more concise. The printing and the get-up leave something to be desired. If Shri Sakhare has not conclusively proved his thesis he has certainly provoked research, for which he must be thanked.

V. M. INAMDAR

RELIGIOUS BIGOTRY AND IMMORALITY*

This book is a valuable and vivid contribution to the seventeenth-century history of the Portuguese empire in India and of the independent kingdom of Arakan, now a part of Burma. Its value lies not only in the rarity of books upon the subject, but in Mr. Collis's reputation for intellectual integrity, his restrained yet fascinating prose. In *The Land of the Great Image* he has brought to light information from sources inaccessible to most readers, and has fully utilised his own explorations and contacts with scholars in India and Arakan.

He takes the reader first to the "Golden City" of Goa, the flamboyant capital of Portuguese Asia, painting a detailed picture after the Frenchman Pyrard, who visited there in 1608. According to this soldier-sailor adventurer, local society, both Latin and Indian, was in a deplorable state of decadence. The white conquerors specialised in kidnapping young people from the neighbouring Indian states. The slave population of Goa became great and cheap, and this insult inflicted on human dignity inevitably degraded the masters. It would appear that ecclesiastical authority approved the slave traffic. Moreover, the ruthless Catholic Inquisition, intent on making converts by fair means or foul, tortured to death or drove from the community the best Hindu, Mohammedan and Christian elements. The author makes effective use of Dr. Dellon's contemporary account of his dreadful misadventures at the hands of the Grand Inquisitor.

The main character of the book, the Augustinian friar Manrique, takes rather long in emerging from this vicious and often macabre Goanese background. It is a structural weakness, perhaps owing to lack of data, that when at last he does appear, he is immediately transferred to the Hindu dominion of Cochin. At an early age, Manrique had left Portugal to convert what he considered to be pagan Asia to what he equally erroneously imagined to be Christianity. Upon the narrative of his *Travels*, Mr. Collis has built the best part of the history.

Friar Manrique set sail from Cochin in 1628 to the town of Hugli, near the present Calcutta, where there was a Portuguese settlement and an Augustinian monastery. He had reason to be amazed at the large crowds of Hindus who, by way of subliminal religious practice, waded into the sea and offered themselves to the sharks. He could make as little sense of self-immolation as the Hindus of the intolerance and cruelty of the Goanese Catholic Inquisition.

After something over a year's stay, Manrique was ordered to Arakan. He carried his message across the Bay of Bengal, probably in one of the Portuguese slave-ships. At Arakan these slaves were the chief source from which he drew converts. Out of 3,400 Hindus and Muslims kidnapped annually, he was able to baptize some 2,000. The irony of this either did not strike him, or, if it did, Mr. Collis suggests that he justified it in this way:—

* *The Land of the Great Image*. By MAURICE COLLIS. (Faber and Faber, Ltd., London. 16s.)

The catastrophe suffered by these innocent persons was only temporal. Their abduction, ruin, enslavement, degradation, were spiritually an extraordinary piece of good fortune for them. Had they remained in their villages, tilling their fields, tending their cows, passing their lives in industry and thrift, happy, simple but ignorant of the essential truth, they were doomed to eternal punishment in hell. This was the consolation he now was able to bring, as he went among them holding out his crucifix. Let them dry their tears, cease to grieve that they had been torn from their homes, would never see their families again, would pass the rest of their lives in servitude; let them rather rejoice because, when he had baptized them, as baptize them he would if they confessed their errors, their happiness in the next world was certain....Their misery and despair did not shock Manrique because his mind was fixed on saving their souls.

The friar passed the next few years in Arakan, the Land of the Great Image of Buddha, visiting most of the chief cities, establishing churches and making converts. His methods were zealous but scarcely ethical. He gained the confidence of the Grand Dowager by a bit of backstairs diplomacy, and ingratiated himself with the King, who was obsessed with the mad notion of becoming Lord of the World. He obtained royal favours for the Christian community with the facility of a scheming courtier. His mission seemed perhaps to coincide too conveniently with Portuguese political interests. During his entire stay in Arakan, Manrique worked hand in glove with the Portuguese government at Goa.

Despite a certain bravery and resoluteness, an ability to make himself agreeable and at times to be kind, his qualities are not likely to arouse the sympathy or admiration of the reader. Indeed, it appears as no more than just retribution when, undertaking a diplomatic mission for the Goanese Viceroy, he was captured by Indians, mistaken for a slaver and severely beaten. Fate further turned the tables by sending as his rescuer a Muslim merchant who showed a compassion for the physical plight of the infidel that the friar had seldom felt for a pagan slave. Far from realising this experience as an opportunity to increase his spiritual stature, Manrique remained as confirmed a bigot as ever. Not at all the desirable moral outcome, but unfortunately true history.

It is, by analogy with current events, of topical interest that the friar shared with the King of Arakan the dream of a religious world unity through military domination that would bring peace and salvation to Asia. In the fancies of these two, the old Christian and Buddhist visions were falsified beyond recognition. That Manrique could ever have hoped to convert Hindu and Muslim Indians and the Buddhist Arakanese to be members of a Catholic world state, with a decidedly Portuguese way of thinking, shows how tightly he was encased in *maya* and in his dogma. Convinced that he was offering something infinitely precious, it did not cross his mind that Christians from the West might be suspect because they had made Indians slaves. Mr. Collis, with the fairness one would expect from the author of *Trials in Burma* and a one-time District magistrate at Rangoon, shrewdly observes:—

But we are the last persons to blame him for that; have we not taken away the liberty of all Indians and at the same time invited them to believe that our civilization is superior to theirs?

DENNIS STOLL

PSYCHISM*

Dr. Bendit is a practising psychiatrist, and Miss Payne is clairvoyant. This work, therefore, is bound to arouse much interest, and, it is to be imagined, controversy in certain quarters. The medical profession, as a whole, will not like it; spiritualistic circles will take umbrage at the authors' treatment of mediumistic phenomena and insistence upon the danger of what they call "negative psychism," as distinguished from the controlled and positive variety presumably practised by Miss Payne in the exercise of her clairvoyance. Mr. L. A. G. Strong, fortunately, in a foreword goes some way to disarm criticism by pointing out that the subject-matter of the book "is not yet susceptible of the kind of proof that would be demanded in a laboratory," and by his statement that the authors are bearing personal witness to their conclusions. Nowhere, perhaps, do the authors make clearer their object in writing this volume than in the chapter on "Psychic Problems," where a comparison is made between the approach of the psychiatrist and the "psychic" respectively to the general problems of health and disease:—

> The psychologist's task is to help the patient to analyse the hidden roots of his fear. The psychic, however, teaches the patient to realise the tension in the mechanism, and how the tension weakens mental and emotional control.

They then suggest that there are at least three angles from which the subject of health may be viewed, *viz.*, medical, psychological, and psychic. They visualize a future where a body of "psychic pathology" may have come into existence, "which can be placed beside, and on a level with, what is already known of the pathology of the body and of the subjective aspects of the mind."

As a mere patient on occasion, your reviewer has some hesitation in contemplating with enjoyment the future possibilities of "psychic" probing being added to the more unsavoury explorations of some medical practitioners! We are living in a Dark Age; and it is not at all clear that scientists are prepared to accept the implications of their discoveries from an ethical point of view.

The authors make reference in their pages to such questions as rebirth, yoga, chakrams, and similar topics. Their statements on these matters have no evidential value, though it is obvious that they are indebted to a large extent to some of the literature loosely comprised in the general term "theosophical." It is a little surprising, therefore, to find omission of any book of such a nature from the "Books Recommended" in an appendix. This absence becomes important in view of the authors' unsupported assertions with regard to "Higher" and "Lower" psychism, and their brief references to methods of *yoga*. They believe that the Western mind has attained some degree of "scientific objectivity," while the background of the Hindu *yogi* "has the practical disadvantage of being vague and nebulous as to material things." For this and other reasons they prefer to approach their subject "from the standpoint of modern psy-

* *The Psychic Sense.* By PHŒBE PAYNE and LAURENCE J. BENDIT. (Faber and Faber, Ltd., London. 7*s*. 6*d*.)

chology rather than by the old traditional route."

But what really does "modern psychology know of these things? How are we to comprehend the act of perception, psychic or other, without knowledge of the nature and attributes of the Perceiver, and the dual nature of the human mind in its activity under cyclic law? There are *vedana* (sense perception) and *vijnana* (the intellectual principle), and both are but manifestations of *karmic* law. It may be that what the Western mind needs is objectivity with regard to the general principles informing ultimate reality, and an associated realization of the significance of moral philosophy in the life of the individual. Certain it is that, without a true metaphysic, the Western methods of research in the realm of psychology are likely to lead to sorcery of the worst description. It is a merit of this volume that the authors are not altogether unaware of these considerations, and that they are obviously desirous of establishing new values in a treacherous field of investigation. But the requisite landmarks have been set up already in the mass of information that was forthcoming at the initiation of the Theosophical Movement in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Why should they be forgotten or ignored?

B. P. HOWELL

POLITICS OF EARLY MUSLIMS*

Nothing speaks so eloquently of the radical vice of our intellectual life as the fact that it is divorced from its own cultural past. It is sustained on an alien soil and is ignorant of its own heritage. No wonder that Islamic thought has been unjustly relegated to the background as of no moment for the present status of our knowledge. That an appreciation of Muslim thinkers is of vital significance for the understanding of medieval thought has been justly stressed by the distinguished French scholar E. Gilson. The acumen of the schoolman Duns Scotus is nourished on the dialectical subtlety of Avicenna and the structure of his thought is inspired by the ontological principles enunciated by the master. Nor is it only in the sphere of speculative thought that the East has been the master of the West. The Spanish savant Miguel Asín Palacios has brought to light the working of Islamic conceptions on European literature. The same holds good of political thought.

Prof. Haroon Khan Sherwani rightly regrets that Islamic political thought has not received its due. He has set himself the laudable task of giving us a glimpse—and more than that he does not pretend to do—into the political theories of Muslim thinkers. Their theories, as he says, were not alienated from political life. They were embedded in facts and some of the theorists like Nizamul Mulk Tusi were themselves statesmen of tried ability. Nor was their political thought alien to moral and religious values.

---

* *Studies in the History of Early Muslim Political Thought and Administration.* By HAROON KHAN SHERWANI, M. A. (Oxon.). (Md. Ashraf, Kashmiri Bazar, Lahore. Rs. 6/-)

Caliphate and Kingship in Medieval Persia. By Dr. AMIR HASAN SIDDIQI. (Md. Ashraf, Kashmiri Bazar, Lahore. Rs. 4/-)

In order to lead us to the right perspective, Professor Sherwani first surveys, rather too cursorily, the political thought of the chief exponents of the East; Confucius, Mencius, Kautylia and Ibn Khaldun. As the political thought of Muslim thinkers is mainly based on the teaching of the *Quran*, he justly deems it necessary to enunciate the Quranic conception of the State. Professor Sherwani rightly protests against the tendency of the European writers to regard political absolutism as exclusively Oriental. Political absolutism may take both healthier and unhealthier forms. It may become a necessity in the life of a nation or it may be superimposed by sheer force. As such it is a universal manifestation and cannot be denounced as an ineradicable vice of the Oriental mind.

Professor Sherwani has admirably dealt with a great subject in a small compass and has convincingly shown that the neglect of Islamic thinkers will leave unfortunate lacunæ in the history of political thought. It is in the fitness of things that the theories of Farabi and Ibn Khaldun should be as diligently studied and as sympathetically appreciated as those of Montesquieu and Vico.

Dr. Amir Hasan's object is different. He is not so much concerned with the theoretical import of the question of the Caliphate as with its historical reality. For better or worse the institution of the Caliphate has left an indelible mark on Muslim history. Thanks to the growing extension of the world of Islam, it was hardly possible for the Caliphs to wield undivided authority everywhere. The emergence of the Turks as a military factor in the reign of Caliph Mutasim was big with dire consequences for the Caliphate. The Turks gradually arrogated to themselves all the authority and the Caliphs lived on their favour. Dr. Hasan shows how, in the struggle between the Caliphate and the Sultanate, the Caliphs were ultimately reduced to nonentities and forced to lead a shadowy existence without any temporal power.

We become painfully conscious of the ideals that could not incorporate themselves in historical reality. The Caliphate was an institution based on the Islamic ideal that religion and politics are not worlds asunder, necessarily in conflict with each other and evolving moralities of their own, but form an indissoluble union founded on the no less indissoluble unity of life. But the Caliphate could not grow equal to its task. Dr. Hasan has shown with a wealth of facts how the Caliphate lost its *raison d'être* and how the Sultanate could ultimately wrench its own freedom from that decadent institution. We only feel that enough justice has not been done to the aspirations and ideals that inspired the institution and enabled it to stir the Muslim mind even in its most decadent days. But Dr. Hasan's book deserves to be read and studied by all those interested in the inner history of political institutions.

S. VAHIDUDDIN

Donne: A Spirit in Conflict. By EVELYN HARDY. (Constable and Co., Ltd., London. 10*s.* 6*d.*)

The renewed interest in Donne which has characterised the last thirty years is understandable enough. Like us, he was torn between two worlds, at once attached to the past by many unconscious ties and consciously repudiating it with a mind as rapacious as it was discerning. The man, Miss Hardy writes, "who stood in the age of shifting emphasis from Catholic to Protestant thought, a transitional experimenter," turned his back upon his literary heritage. Yet the daring originality with which he broke through to the future with all the avidity of a Renaissance individualism was balanced and opposed in the deeps of his being by a morbid mediævalism, while his mind was entangled in the scholastic casuistry which his first teachers, the Jesuits, had clamped upon it.

Yet to write thus is to generalise. The extraordinary impression which Donne makes whether in the "Songs and Sonnets" of his youth or the sermons of his age is due to his unparalleled consciousness of himself. To judge by the imagery of his poetry, the visible world hardly existed for him, nor for that matter did his mistress or even his God save in the light, often lurid, of his relation to them. Never was a man so haunted, so imprisoned by himself, so conscious of his own dread drama in a world to which he could seldom reconcile himself and which inflamed his appetites and humiliated his spirit save in moments of ecstatic release.

In her concluding chapter Miss Hardy tentatively analyses the basic disease within him in the light of modern psychological knowledge, fastening particularly upon what she boldly calls "that revolting sermon, *Death's Duell,*" with its ruthlessly repulsive harping upon the nightmare of original sin. Pernicious as this doctrine undoubtedly was when it took root in a morbid soil, she is perhaps too ready to dismiss it as being entirely divorced from reality and to suggest that if only Donne could have sat at the feet of the liberal rationalist Lecky of a later day, all would have been well with him. She is more convincing when she compares Donne with Hamlet, whose exact contemporary he was and of whom, in the unresolvable conflict which tormented him, he was a close counterpart. How this conflict originated no one can answer, as Miss Hardy confesses, though she makes some interesting conjectures. But it would be misleading to suggest that she is unduly preoccupied with it.

Her book is primarily of value as a well-written, scholarly biography, embodying all the new facts which research in recent years has brought to light, yet without pedantry or dullness. She reviews Donne's verse and prose briefly, but in a just perspective, and she is particularly good in her detailed drawing of the contemporary background. There was much in Tudor England that reminds one of Nazi Germany, both in the barbaric persecutions and executions, and what she calls "the inordinate desire for death in the nation." Donne's enlightened toleration, despite the intense strain of personal fanaticism, is the more remarkable. It was not without danger that he could confess in that age, "You know I have never imprisoned the word Religion: not straigheting it friarly...nor immuring it in a Rome or a Geneva; they are all virtual beams of one Sun...connatural pieces of one circle. Religion is Christianity." To-day, perhaps, so honest a man would have omitted the last three words.

HUGH I'A. FAUSSET

20th Century Psalter. By RICHARD CHURCH. (J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., London. 5*s.*)

It is a bold poet who will invite comparison between himself and the psalmist David, yet that is in effect what, for no very apparent reason other than that of a literary whim—since David and he are not the only poets who have sung in time of trouble —Mr. Church seems to be doing here. These are some sixty sets of verses, one for the morning and one for the evening of each day in a month, held together by a rather redundant similarity of theme, one or two semi-symbolical iterations and an occasional reminiscence of the earlier psalter. Though the scheme of these poems demands that there should be sixty of them, one feels that it would be more satisfying to have half that number but the same amount of poetry. For poetry there undoubtedly is in these pages; here and there the poetic imagination successfully overcomes Mr. Church's abundant facility. It requires the poetic imagination to know and to state, in these times, that we in England share with Germany the guilt of the burning of the City of London; that the outcome of suffering is wisdom and that "if the fool will persist in his folly he will eventually become wise"; that death gives birth to life and is essentially a theme for praise; that "the serener spirit finds pure all that can happen to us." The trouble is that these verses are only the bread-and-scrape of poetry; the poetry in them rescues them from superficiality, but it appears to have been insufficiently distilled; it is emotion which, even if the necessary tranquillity is hard to find in these days, cannot properly be said to have been recollected. One suspects that these poems were as easy to write as they are to read, and that King David found his task more difficult.

R. H. WARD

Proto-Indic Religion. By S. ŚRIKANTHA ŚASTRI, M. A. (Published by the Author, 310, D. Subbaiya Road, Mysore. Re. 1/8 ; 3*s.* or $ .75) The Indus Valley excavations have considerably pushed back the history of Indian civilisation and have opened a new vista of historical research. On the basis of seals, figurines, amulets, pottery and objects of worship, and also of funeral customs, the author has attempted a comparative study of Proto-Indic religion with that disclosed by the *Atharva Veda.* He concludes that the civilisation shows predominantly Vedic characteristics, particularly those of the age of the *Atharva Veda.* But many distinguished antiquarians have traced Dravidian or at least pre-Aryan influences in the ancient forms of worship. The author's conclusions can, therefore, in the present stage of investigation, at best be accepted as plausible hypotheses. Shri Sastri's brochure provokes inquiry.

V. M. I.

Jesus Christ. By S. K. GEORGE. (World Teachers Series, G. A. Natesan and Co., Madras. As. 12)

The Woman at the Well. By GOTHIAN. (Andrew Dakers, Ltd., London. 5*s.*)

Jesus Christ by S. K. George is a valuable addition to the Natesan series of "World Teachers." It is not easy to compress the life of Jesus Christ within the number of pages allotted to this series. Mr. George has, however, been remarkably successful in doing it in his own unique way. Apart from this, the book has but little merit as there is nothing original in the interpretation of Jesus, his teachings and his miracles. For over fifty years, eminent Christian scholars and critics have written volumes on the historic fact of Jesus Christ and his teachings, which have revolutionised Christian thought and outlook not a little. Mr. George's emphasis on the historic Jesus and his humanity therefore comes a bit late in the day. However, it is welcome, as perhaps no other Indian scholar has written from this standpoint so clearly and in such a thought-provoking manner.

Doubtless, history has its value; but as far as the life of great souls like Jesus Christ and others of his type is concerned, the principles that they preached, lived and died for are of greater importance than the historic incidents connected with their lives. To us, it is not the historic fact of Jesus Christ but the principles he formulated that are a source of greater inspiration and strength.

Gothian's *The Woman at the Well*, on the other hand, contains refreshing sketches of a few well-chosen New Testament personalities, *viz.*, Mary, Judas, Mary Magdalene, Peter and the Woman at the Well. These can be considered to represent humanity. The author has depicted them in a delightful manner. The one on the "Woman at the Well" is exceptionally poetic and instructive and the author's generous and sympathetic treatment of Judas Iscariot deserves praise. The uncommon way in which the author expresses mystic experience is most inspiring; one is inclined to wonder if he is not a Theosophist in his spiritual outlook, and to wish that he had written the life of Jesus in his inimitable manner.

Unfortunately, he seems to have no clear views on life after death. Now we find him enthusiastic over souls seeking ever for wombs in which they may be reborn and now we find him consigning souls to Purgatory to perfect themselves. The word Purgatory probably is ill-chosen and does not convey his idea. His complacent obliviousness of the historic factor is really interesting.

A few of the sentences in this volume may be misconstrued due to their lack of preciseness, as that for instance on p. 149 where he refers to "Magnetic attraction, like to like etc." This is incorrect but if he meant the law of personal magnetism it would support his case. Again, on p. 163 we find the phrase "I reproduce myself" attributed to Sri Buddha and not to Sri Krishna of the *Bhagavad-Gita.*

On the whole the simple language and the lucid manner and also the earnest spirit in which *The Woman at the Well* is written are praiseworthy and some of the spiritual exhortations are well worth serious attention.

S. A. DAS

The Totalitarian War and After. By COUNT CARLO SFORZA. (George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London. 3*s.* 6*d.*)

Never Again! Edited by CLIFFORD BAX. (Hutchinson and Co. (Publishers), Ltd., London. 1*s.*)

I have read *The Totalitarian War and After* four times now (and twice with considerable care), and I still just cannot say what it is about! In no part of its commentary on international events and national reactions to them between the First and Second World Wars do I find any clear idea emerging which derives from what goes before or is developed in what comes after. The personal reminiscences seem to add nothing or almost nothing to common knowledge, and do not seem either to lead to any common point. I can seldom recall having read a book by any one of anything like equivalent distinction which left me at the end so baffled as to what the author was seeking to say. Frankly, after my earlier readings, I was inclined to attribute my reaction to pure mental weariness, but after a final detailed perusal I do not think it is just that. Count Sforza knows his world of high politics and his heart is in the right place, but his mind gives an effect of not having penetrated the chaos and the flux to sufficient depth to have perceived the order and organic development underlying all these more superficial manifestations.

The general theme of the contributors to *Never Again!* is that since unfortunately the entire German nation cannot be exterminated some less desirable alternative will have to be sought, but very few valuable lines of constructive thought emerge from the miscellaneous suggestions which follow. The problem posed is one of first importance, but it will need to be confronted on a much higher level, both spiritual and intellectual, before it approaches fruitful solution. Every war has its horrors, and this type of pamphleteering is one of them.

GEOFFREY WEST

Immortal India: Or India's Deathless Heritage and Priceless Contribution to the World. By L. H. AJWANI, M.A. (The Educational Publishing Co., Karachi. Rs. 2/8)

It is not easy to compress within the limits of a small book like this an account of India's ancient past or to deal in detail with all the aspects of her greatness. Yet that is what the author has attempted. Laying right stress on the fundamental unity of India, Professor Ajwani perceives this golden thread of unity running through the teachings of the ancient sages and the Indian way of life. The chapters on Indian kings and warriors, on Indian women and on the arts and sciences cannot but fill one with admiration for the ancient glory that was India. The past is clear but the future is all fog and mist and the book closes with but brief reference to India's clamant demand for self-determination.

Two things, however, must be said. The renaissance of Indian literatures today has hardly received attention. As holding a mirror to the workings of the contemporary spirit in India a chapter about this literary awakening would have been appropriate. Secondly, much of the book is quotation. Shall we say—of course without disparagement—Quotation, thy name is Professor?

V. M. INAMDAR

Spiritual Authority and Temporal Power in the Indian Theory of Government. By ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY. (American Oriental Series, Vol. XXII (1942). American Oriental Society, New Haven, Conn.)

In the Indian theory of Government, the exact relationship of the spiritual authority and the temporal power has not been properly understood or has been misunderstood. Even an Indologist like A. B. Keith has gone wrong when he states that the connection of royalty with the priestly rank had long disappeared before the time of the Samhitas. Dr. Coomaraswamy has in this book endeavoured, with ability and success, to show the mutual relationship that existed between the King and the Purohita during the Vedic age and thereafter. It amounted to the "marriage" of the Priest (brahma) and the King (kshatra) who were representatives of the Sky and the Earth. The essential purpose of this "marriage" was insurance against drought and privation (*abhva*). This marriage, which should be that of Mitra (Sun) and Varuna (Sky) ensured the commonweal.

The learned author takes a correct view of the theory when he says, "What the Purohita knows, the King performs." The Purohita is the guardian of the realm and the King is the father of the people. The welfare of the kingdom depends on him who is exalted by the quality of self-possession. Self-assertion is suicidal. Real government depends on self-control, Rule on regard for Law. The Ruler by Divine Right cannot be, according to the Indian conception, an *absolute* ruler. For he is subject to another King, *viz.*, Dharma (Law), than which there is nothing higher. Does not the Upanishad call Law the "King of Kings"? In this connection the Vasordhara doctrine is outlined and explained by the representation of a Cakravartin at Amaravati (reproduced as the frontispiece), surrounded by his seven treasures, raising his right arm to the clouds, from which a shower of coins is falling.

The belief was that unless the King fulfilled his primary function as Patron of the sacrifice, the circulation of the "Shower of Wealth," the limitless, inexhaustible food of the God that falls from the Sky as Rain and is returned from the Earth to the Sky in the smoke of the burnt-offering, will be interrupted. It is manifest that this circulation continued to be uninterrupted down to the epoch of the Mauryas. Kautilya definitely assigns a distinct place to the Purohita in the scheme of his polity by a significant statement that that kingdom alone prospers where *śāstra* (Counsel) and *śastra* (Power) co-operate with and are assimilated to each other. The fundamental principle that has governed the Indian polity through the ages is that intellect alone does not count, nor brute force alone. What really counts is a harmonious blending of might and intellect.

Our thanks are due to Dr. Coomaraswamy for producing this admirable volume. He has indeed made a notable contribution, quite original in character, to an intriguing aspect of ancient Hindu administration.

V. R. R. DIKSHITAR

ENDS AND SAYINGS

"_____ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers."
HUDIBRAS

China has been bearing the brunt for seven years with a courage and a staunchness that will go down in history. Congratulations to the gallant nation poured in from press and publicists on the seventh anniversary of China's war, which has since become that of her Allies. Are not men ever ready to praise the bridge that carries them across? But fair words load no guns and furnish no planes, in which China is woefully deficient. The Chinese, as Mr. Eugene Lyons recently remarked of the Russians, "want our tanks, not our thanks."

In a characteristic message George Bernard Shaw said—"When I was born, China was the despair of the civilised world. Now that I am old, she is its hope. Do not let the hope be disappointed."

The Chinese are impeccably courteous. And they are tolerant. Mme. Chiang Kai-Shek's addresses before the U. S. Senate and House of Representatives a few months ago were models of graciousness and tact as well as of breadth of vision. But tucked in the speech to the latter (not given extempore, *nota bene*, but read from a prepared script) was a tell-tale Chinese proverb. It may well have brought a blush to many a cheek: "It takes little effort to watch the other fellow carry the load."

The plain fact is that the Chinese have not been accepted as allies on equal terms, and the Allies' cause has suffered for it. Their offer to help defend Singapore and the Dutch East Indies was not accepted. The Chinese troops were not allowed to move into Burma until Rangoon had fallen, though they had been waiting for weeks on the border. And yet—Pearl Buck has drawn attention to the fact—"The only country to declare itself officially for the freedom of all peoples, and for equality among all, has been China." If India could speak for herself and act for herself, her old friend China would not stand alone in open allegiance to those ideals which are also India's.

Private prejudices play strange pranks with public objectives. Writes Miss Pearl Buck in *The New York Times*:—

> There are Americans in the South who would rather see Hitler win than give up their discrimination against the Negro. There are other Americans who would rather lose the war than see equality granted to the Asian peoples. There are Englishmen who would rather let Hitler win than give freedom to India.

Pearl Buck by her recent utterances on the war has come to be its front-rank critic. Time and again has she demanded a clarification of war aims. In a recent article in *The New York Times* Miss Buck reaffirms her faith that the freedom and democracy for which this war is waged must be freedom and democracy for all. Higher than President Roosevelt's famous "Four Freedoms"—freedom of speech

and of worship, freedom from want and from fear, she would set "the great freedom to be free."

Men would rather be starving and free than fed in bonds. They had rather live in fear of all sorts of trouble and insecurity if they can only be free. We misjudge the highest nature of man when we think that if we can keep him fed and secure under his own roof, let him say what he likes and go to church on Sunday, that he will be content. He will not be content, anywhere in the world, until he lives a free man in a free country, his people free in a world of the free.

How very superior are the Four Points of Chiang Kai-Shek compared to the Four Freedoms—which are noble words which remain to be acted out, but which can be implemented by the former :—

Firstly, there must be no negotiated peace.

Secondly, the future peace should seek the emancipation of all mankind.

Thirdly, a joint machinery for winning the peace as well as war should be set up by the United Nations.

Fourthly, there must be a post-war world organisation with an international force.

Mr. H. A. Wallace, the United States Vice-President, made a vigorous speech at Detroit, the scene of Negro riots, in which he also repeated the necessity of justice to the world as a whole. Nationalistic selfishness not only interferes with the well-being of numerous other states, but reaps its own harvest of greed and class-strife within its own borders. Therefore Mr. Wallace was right in saying :—

We shall not be satisfied with a peace which will merely lead us from concentration camps and mass murder of Fascism into an international jungle of gangster governments operated behind scenes by power-crazed money-mad imperialists. We seek a peace that is more than a mere breathing space between the death of the old tyranny and the birth of a new one....Our choice is between Democracy for everybody or for a few. Fuller Democracy for all is a lasting preventive of war. We cannot fight Fascism abroad and condone race riots at home. Three outstanding peace time responsibilities as I find them to-day are firstly, the enlightenment of the people, secondly, mobilising peace time production for full employment and thirdly, planning world co-operation.

The unsuitable type of education imparted to our girls today has received more censure than constructive suggestions for its betterment. But Dr. D. N. Maitra of Calcutta at a recent conference outlined in brief his new scheme of education better suited to the sex. (*Calcutta Municipal Gazette*, 3rd July 1943). He proposes to start shortly at Calcutta a college where would be taught such subjects as would "contribute to a full, cultured and efficient life, and would also have adequate practical and economic value." We are glad that the scheme proposes to impart an education that could serve a practical purpose in the sphere of life in which most women have to be efficient and accomplished, *viz.*, the home. The detailed syllabus is reported under preparation.

The grinding mills of University examinations, with more emphasis on memory than on creative effort, leave too many sapped of energy on the threshold of life, ill-equipped to meet its demands. The system bears especially hard upon our girls. They are by nature more delicate and a degree is but poor compensation for their strenuous pursuit of education mainly—though imperfectly—designed for boys. Dr. Maitra's experimental scheme is reported to be

based on the harmonised combination of the highest Indian traditions with the ideals of

modern progress imparting the intrinsic joy and strength of an all-round and useful knowledge, helping in the development of a balanced character and personality in a healthy and beautiful body, training them for a better and more useful companionship as a wife and more efficient motherhood and opening for those who so desired new careers offering new sources of livelihood.

The late Dr. R. R. Marett of Oxford pleads for a fair deal for "the little peoples" in "Natural Selection and the Lesser Folk." (*The Hibbert Journal*, April 1943). Adaptation to environment as applied to man means coming to terms not only with the earth but with fellow-men.

A cosmopolitan justice...is barely conceivable in idea, so little has been done to guarantee the rights of the more backward and defenceless peoples.

But many will agree with Dr. Marett in being of two minds how far they want the unifying process to go.

Every community, big or small, is bound to evolve a soul of its own; and with the advantage, I should guess, to the small one. Climate, race and language, to mention only those minor factors of differentiation, together set up a loom which can turn out as many patterns as there are weavers to devise them each according to his own taste; and, if it be but a leisurely hand-loom instead of a whirling machine that caters for millions, there will be all the more scope left for the creative imagination, which cannot be hurried.

Dr. Marett wisely deprecates too drastic a policy, however well intentioned, of interfering with the settled habits and convictions even of the modern savage, stipulating only that he keep his more aggressive activities within certain bounds.

And Dr. Marett as an anthropologist deplores the "Europeanism" of the attitude towards human history.

We may have heard of the Scandinavian discoverers of America in the eleventh century; but the no less intrepid voyages of those Vikings of the Pacific, the Polynesians, are hardly mentioned in the best academic society. Or, if these gallant souls were forsooth but barbarians, what of China, with a culture of longer standing than any that we ourselves can show?

The following comments of the Very Rev. W. R. Inge will be received by some with a derisive smile and murmur—"The poor gloomy Dean again!" We quote them for they carry an important truth:—

Contemporary Europe has committed suicide. The sun is setting in the west and rising in the east. Asia will have her long deferred revenge upon her arrogant younger sister. The reckless squandermania of our Government is the prelude to bankruptcy, the repudiation, in one form or another, of public debts. The gifts of *panem et circenses* to the masses will end as they did in the Roman empire. The parasite will destroy its host. "Those wounds heal ill that men do give themselves."

The new Dark Age, which may or may not be a long one, will certainly generate a revival of religion. But what kind of religion? We have probably had our day as a Great Power, but I do not think that as a nation we are degenerate, in spite of the efforts of lay and clerical demagogues to debauch the citizenship of the electorate. "When He slew them they sought Him, and turned them early and enquired after God." I have hopes that the uses of adversity will not be altogether sour, though they can hardly be sweet. What are my hopes for a new reformation?

What kind of "A New Reformation" does he propose in his interesting article in the April *Hibbert Journal?*—

Those who have known members of the working class individually will certainly not despair of them. But among their worst enemies are the court-chaplains of King Demos, who are clever enough to say now what might well have been said a hundred years ago. The new Reformation must beware of them.

An Erasmian Reformation, to follow the Lutheran Reformation of 400 years ago! Yes,

that is what we should like to see; humanism, science, even politics, if such a thing were possible, brought into willing captivity to the obedience of Christ. But who have been the great pioneers? Origen, condemned as a heretic in the reign of Justinian; Erasmus, whose books are on the Index; Sir Thomas More, beheaded; Bruno, burnt alive. Are not the Quakers, as a body, the best Christians now in the world? They are the smallest of all the sects, and they do not increase. "A popular religion is always a corrupt religion," said Cardinal Newman, the *enfant terrible* of Catholicism. No; we may have an Erasmian Reformation; I pray God we may; but we shall never have an Erasmian Church.

The discussion in the *Northern India Observer* for July 1943 of training for journalism in India is timely and important. Shri Diwan Chand Sharma urges expansion of the Department of Journalism of the Panjab University into a School of Journalism. The Head of that Department, Shri Prithvi Singh, goes into curricular details. Both discuss Western precedents and make out a good case for the practical advantages of such a professional school. But training in the practical field is not the only need.

It is too often tacitly assumed that anyone who can push a pen with ease will be good enough for the job. It is argued that since the journalist has to traffic in ephemeral interests, he need not worry much about tomorrow. That is a dangerous fallacy. Very few formulate their own opinions. The vast majority depend on editorial views. The chronicler of contemporary events is therefore not merely a chronicler. He is the maker of that mighty force in the modern world—public opinion. So important did this rôle seem to one American millionaire that a bequest of a million dollars was left to Harvard University a few years ago to "elevate the standards of journalism."

The journalist, moreover, represents the people. As such a representative he must represent them well. He their friendly critic and advocate. discharge this responsibility, he mu have a well-informed, unbiassed ou look. That means that he must be mo than a student of the technique journalism, which, however necessar is incidental. He must be a close an observant student of life. Schools Journalism are certainly desirable b they must deepen as well as broad the minds of their students so th they can keep their heads above t flood of prejudice and predilectio short-sighted sympathies and creed loyalties. Journalism of the highe type is more than a career. It is a avenue of service to moral values an ideals, to human brotherhood.

Mr. B. J. Wadia, Vice-Chancellor o the Bombay University, speaking o August 2nd at a Bombay meeting i honour of Shri Ramananda Chatterje described journalism as a calling an as "one of the most responsible task ever entrusted to a citizen." H deplored that whereas twenty Univer sities in the U. S. A. had Schools o Colleges of Journalism, a single India University, that of the Panjab, coul boast even a Department of Journalism Mr. S. A. Brelvi, who followed him o the programme, said that for man journalism was more a mission than profession.

The Press in every country is the expres sion of its beliefs and aspirations. In Indi situated as we are, the Press is the mos potent instrument for securing the libertie of the people and safeguarding them....Th Press has a great power not only for goo but also for evil, and the test of a tru journalist lies in this, that he should us that power for advancing the cause of huma freedom and not of human quarrels an jealousies. Higher tribute cannot be pai to any man than to say that he has con tributed to the advancement of his countr in all its phases and that he has used hi influence for good.

Ramananda Chatterjee, he added was one of the most distinguished o those in our day to whom this tribut could be paid.